# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 081 EA 017 765

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Annual Evaluation Report: Fiscal Year 1984. |
| INSTITUTION | Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation. |
| PUB DATE | 84 |
| NOTE | 344p.; For 1983 evaluation, see ED 240 747. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC14 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Adult Education; American Indian Education; Bilingual Education Programs; Block Grants; Categorical Aid; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Assessment; Educational Improvement; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Objectives; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Government School Relationship; Libraries; Minority Groups; Postsecondary Education; *Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Rehabilitation Programs; Special Education; Vocational Education |
| IDENTIFIERS | General Education Provisions Act 1974 |

ABSTRACT

This 14th annual report to Congress provides program-by-program summaries of evaluative information on federally funded education programs for fiscal year (FY) 1984. Each entry is divided into three major sections: (1) program profile, covering legislation, recent funding history, purpose, eligibility, and other information on requirements; (2) response to congressional mandates in the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), section 417(a), containing information specified in the mandate, such as program goals, progress and accomplishments, cost effectiveness, plans for improvement and legislative recommendations, supporting studies, and data on participants; and (3) response to GEPA 417(b), containing summary information on evaluation contracts. Program descriptions are grouped under the following Department of Education jurisdictional headings: (1) Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, (2) Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, (3) Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, (4) Office of Vocational and Adult Education, (5) Office of Postsecondary Education, and (6) Office of Educational Research and Improvement. An index is provided, along with an appendix listing evaluation contracts active in the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation during FY 1984. (TE)

***********************************************************************
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
***********************************************************************

ED256081

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

# ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

## FISCAL YEAR 1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation

EA 017 765

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword.......... i

Acknowledgment.......... ii

Chapter Number*

## 1. Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Education of Disadvantaged Children (Chapter 1, ECIA) Formula Grants to Local Education Agencies..........101
Migrant Education Program (Chapter 1, ECIA) Formula Grants to State Education Agencies..........102
Formula Grants to States for Neglected or Delinquent Children...103
Consolidation of Federal Programs for Elementary and Secondary Education—Chapter 2 State Block Grant..........104
General Assistance to the Virgin Islands..........105
Civil Rights Technical Assistance and Training..........106
Follow Through—Grants to Local Education Agencies and Other Non-Profit Agencies..........107
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (Impact Aid): Maintenance and Operations..........108
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (Impact Aid): Construction..........109
Allen J. Ellender Fellowships..........110
Indian Education—Financial Assistance to Local Education Agencies and Indian-Controlled Schools—Part A..........111
Special Programs for Indian Students—Part B..........112
Special Programs for Indian Adults—Part C..........113
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program..........114
Women's Educational Equity..........115
Migrant Education—High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP)..........116
Arts in Education Program..........117
Inexpensive Books Distribution Program..........118
Secretary's Discretionary Program—Discretionay Activities to Improve Elementary and Secondary Education..........119

## 2. Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs

Bilingual Education—Discretionary Grants to Local Education Agencies..........201
Bilingual Vocational Education Programs—Discretionary Grants...202
Transition Program for Refugee Children..........203
Bilingual Education Training Programs—Discretionary Grants.....204
Bilingual Education Support Services..........205
Emergency Immigrant Education Program..........206

* Chapter numbers, followed by page within chapters, appear in the upper—right corner of each page.

Chapter Number*

## 3. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Aid to States for Education of Handicapped in State Operated and State Supported Schools ....301
Handicapped School Programs ....302
State Incentive Grants for Preschool Services to Handicapped Children ....303
Handicapped Regional Resource Centers ....304
Handicapped Innovative Programs—Deaf Blind Centers ....305
Early Childhood Education Program for Handicapped Children ....306
Innovative Programs for Severely Handicapped Children ....307
Postsecondary Education Progams for Handicapped Persons ....308
Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped ....309
Handicapped Teacher Recruitment and Information ....310
Discretionary Grants for Handicapped—Innovation and Development Program ....311
Discretionary Grants for Handicapped—Media Services and Captioned Films ....312
Education of the Handicapped Act—Special Studies ....313
Secondary Education and Transitional Services for Handicapped Youth ....314
National Institute of Handicapped Research ....324
Rehabilitation Services—Basic Support ....325
Client Assistance Program (CAP) ....326
Discretionary Project Grants for Training Rehabilitation Personnel ....327
Grants for Vocational Rehabilitation of Severely Handicapped Individuals ....328
Special Projects for Initiating Recreation Programs for Handicapped Individuals ....329
Rehabilitation Services—Special Projects for Handicapped Migratory and Seasonal Farmworkers ....330
Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults ....331
Rehabilitation Services—Projects with Industry ....332
Centers for Independent Living ....333
Vocational Rehabilitation Service Projects for Handicapped American Indians ....334

## 4. Office of Vocational and Adult Education

Vocational Education—Basic Grants to States ....401
Vocational Education—Special Programs for the Disadvantaged ....402
Vocational Education—Formula Grants to States for Consumer and Homemaking Education ....403
Vocational Education—Indian Tribes and Indian Organizations ....404
Vocational Education—Programs of National Significance ....405
Adult Education—State-Administered Progam ....406

* Chapter numbers, followed by page numbers within chapters, appear in the upper-right corner of each page.

Chapter Number*

## 5. Office of Postsecondary Education

Pell (Basic Educational Opportunity) Grant Progam................501
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program..............502
State Student Incentive Grants..................................503
Guaranteed Student Loan Program.................................504
Direct Loan Program.............................................505
Work-Study Program..............................................506
Upward Bound....................................................507
Talent Search...................................................508
Educational Opportunity Centers.................................509
Special Services for Disadvantaged Students.....................510
Veterans' Cost-of-Instruction Program...........................511
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.............512
Training Program for Special Programs
Staff and Leadership Personnel..................................513
Institutional Aid Programs......................................514
Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program...............515
Law School Clinical Experience Program..........................516
Legal Training for the Disadvantaged............................517
Fellowships for Graduate and Professional Study.................518
Fulbright-Hays Training Grants Program..........................519
Foreign Language Training and Area Studies......................520
Cooperative Education...........................................521
College Housing Program.........................................522
Annual Interest Subsidy Grants..................................523
Loans for Construction, Reconstruction, and Renovation
of Academic Facilities..........................................524

## 6. Office of Educational Research and Improvement **

Territorial Teacher Training Assistance Program.................601
Public Library Services--Grants to State Library Agencies.......602
Interlibrary Cooperation--Grants to State Library Agencies......603
College Library Resources--Discretionary Grants.................604
Library Career Training--Discretionary Grants...................605
Library Research and Demonstrations--Discretionary Grants.......606
Strengthening Research Library Resources--Discretionary
Grants to Major Research Libraries..............................607
Public Library Construction--Grants to State Library Agencies...608

Appendix--Evaluation Contracts Active in OPBE
During Fiscal Year 1984.........................................A-1

Index to the Annual Evaluation Report...........................I-1

---

* Chapter numbers, followed by page numbers within chapters, appear in the upper-right corner of each page.

** The National Diffusion Network and the Education Television and Technology Program are administered by the Office of Eduational Research and Improvement. Chapter 119 on the Secretary's Discretionary Program describes these programs.

# Foreword

This is the 14th annual report to Congress on federally funded education programs and the fifth such report submitted by the Department of Education. The Annual Evaluation Report responds to Congressional mandates in Section 417(a) of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), in Section 1246 of the Education Amendments of 1978, in Section 1305 of the Education Amendments of 1980, and in Section 705 of the Education Amendments of 1984.

A year ago, for the fiscal year 1983 edition, the Planning and Evaluation Service (PES) in the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, extensively revised the report's format. The objective was to make the report more responsive to requirements of the mandates. Another effort by PES which continued in fiscal year 1984 was to reduce the report size by including only new information from the fiscal year of the report. The objective was to eliminate material already reported in detail in previous editions. These efforts have led to a streamlined and focused report which should be more useful to the Congress and to the Department.

In the Education Amendments of 1984, the Congress extended the annual due date for the report from November 1 to December 31. The additional time for reporting after the fiscal year's end makes it possible to include data on a program's end-of-year activities. Nonetheless, we have "closed the books" for reporting purposes as of September 30, 1984, except for brief references to new authorizing legislation passed early in fiscal year 1985.

I would appreciate suggestions on making the report still more useful to you in your work. Please direct your comments to Edward Glassman in the Planning and Evaluation Service, at (202) 245-8281 or at the address below.

Gary L. Bauer
Deputy Under Secretary for
Planning, Budget and Evaluation

For copies while our limited
supply lasts, contact:

Mr. Edward B. Glassman
Office of planning, Budget and Evaluation
Planning and Evaluation Service
Room 3127, FOB-6
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

# Acknowledgment

The Planning and Evaluation Service (PES) continues its effort to improve the technical and editorial quality of the report, while reducing its size by focusing on current-year information. We have shortened the document by 46% during the past two years. This effort should make the report more useful to its intended audience in the Congress and in the Department of Education.

A special word of thanks is in order to Janice Anderson, Acting Deputy Director of PES, who reviewed each chapter for content and style. Each Division Director of PES (Salvatore Corrallo, Alan Ginsburg, Robert Maroney, Frank Nassetta, and Robert Stonehill) reviewed the Division's work with support from a lead editor for each Division (Robert Berls, Robert Barnes, Edward Glassman, Ann Weinheimer, and Arthur Kirschenbaum, respectively).

In PES, Edward Glassman was again responsible for coordination of report preparation, with support from Leona Edwards and Yvonne Briscoe. All analysts and all secretaries in PES contributed through writing, revising, and typing the program chapters. Program offices in the Department helped with detailed comments on draft chapters about their own programs. Finally, as in past years, Budget Service in the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, the Office of the Under Secretary, the Office of General Counsel, and the Office of Legislation and Public Affairs, provided extensive and invaluable corrections and comments on draft materials for the entire report.

John D. Klenk
Director, Planning and
Evaluation Service

# OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

# EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN (CHAPTER 1, ECIA)
# FORMULA GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.010)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), enacted as part of Subtitle D of Title V of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 (20 USC 3801-3807). (Expires September 30, 1987)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year: | Total Authorization: | Total Appropriation: | Appropriations for LEA Grants: 1/ |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $6,291,969,913 | $3,215,593,000 | $2,731,651,464 |
| 1981 | 7,047,423,325 | 3,104,317,000 | 2,611,386,972 |
| 1982 | 3,480,000,000 | 3,033,969,000 | 2,562,753,163 |
| 1983 | 3,480,000,000 | 3,200,394,000 | 2,727,587,568 |
| 1984 | 3,480,000,000 | 3,480,000,000 | 3,003,680,000 |

Note: The Chapter 1 program is forward funded, e.g., funds appropriated in FY 1984 are available for use during school year 1984-85.

Purpose: To provide financial assistance to local education agencies (LEAs) to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Eligible Recipients: Local education agencies receive grants under Chapter 1. The size of the grant is primarily based on the number of children in low-income families within the district. Chapter 1 also makes payments to State education agencies (SEAs) for administration and for State-operated programs, to the Insular Areas, and to the Secretary of the Interior for the education of Indian children.

The Department is responsible for calculating State and then county allocations, using a formula which takes into account, among other things, the number of 5-17 year old children in low-income families and the average State per-pupil expenditure. SEAs are then responsible for making sub-county allocations to their LEAs. LEAs identify eligible school attendance areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families.

Eligible Beneficiaries:
Chapter 1 serves educationally deprived children, in public and private schools, who reside in eligible attendance areas.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives:

In school year 1983-84, the second year in which school districts provided compensatory educational services under Chapter 1, the Department's principal goals and objectives for this program were:

## A. Goals and Objectives: (continued)

- To enable SEAs and LEAs to implement programs and projects designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

- To implement changes in the law resulting from the passage of the 1983 ECIA Technical Amendments (P.L. 98-211) by publishing proposed regulations.

- To assist SEAs and LEAs in their program improvement efforts by continuing the "Secretary's Initiative to Improve the Quality of Chapter 1 Projects." Starting in school year 1983-84 and continuing in school year 1984-85, the Department is sponsoring: (1) a national program to identify unusually successful Chapter 1 projects; (2) development of a "Chapter 1 Resource Book," designed to disseminate program improvement strategies and profiles of unusually successful projects; and (3) technical assistance to local school districts to implement program improvement strategies.

- To improve the quality of program information by revising the forms used for collecting participation and evaluation information from SEAs; and to collect information on participants' gender, race, and age (as required by P.L. 98-211).

## B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- Nationwide data about Chapter 1 program operations in school year 1983-84 will be available in Spring, 1985. See Section II.C. of this chapter for information on program scope and effectiveness for the 1982-83 school year.

- Notices of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) for 34 CFR Parts 200 and 204, implementing the changes enacted in the 1983 Technical Amendments, were published on August 9, 1984. Comments were specifically invited in several areas, including evaluation, and were due by November 9, 1984.

- The contracts to operate four evaluation Technical Assistance Centers (TACs) were extended in September, 1984 through September 30, 1985. As part of the "Secretary's Initiative to Improve the Quality of Chapter 1, ECIA Projects" for school year 1984-85, the TACs will commit at least 25 percent of their resources to assist SEAs and LEAs in developing and implementing program improvement activities.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope: The most recent data about this program are from the 1982-83 school year, the first year in which Chapter 1 was implemented nationally. These data show:

- Approximately $2.56 billion were distributed to about 14,000 eligible LEAs.

- States served about 4,750,000 children during the regular school term, of whom approximately:

  - 4,570,000 attended public schools,
  - 180,000 attended private schools.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness: (continued)

- Children served ranged from prekindergarteners through 12th graders. About 3,330,000 children, or 70 percent of the children receiving Chapter 1 services, were in grades one through six (E.1).

- Approximately one-half the Chapter 1 participants were white, one-third black, and one-fifth Hispanic (Table 1). Because different States reported each year, the differences in ethnic data provided to the Department for school years 1982-83 and 1981-82 may not represent actual shifts in ethnic participation. For instance, the dramatic shift in Hispanic participation (shown in Table 1) resulted at least in part because California reported ethnic data only for school year 1982-83. Only 36 States reported ethnic data in school year 1982-83 compared to a different set of 40 States that reported in the 1981-82 school year.

Table 1

Reported Ethnic Group Participation

| | White | Black | Hispanic | American Indian, Alaskan Native, or Asian/Pacific Islander |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| School Year 1982-83 | 45 % | 29 % | 22 % | 4 % |
| School Year 1981-82 | 54 % | 32 % | 11 % | 3 % |

Types of Benefits Provided: In school year 1982-83:

- 74 percent of all Chapter 1 students (approximately 3,520,000 students) received reading instruction,

- 45 percent (approximately 2,160,000 students) received mathematics instruction,

- 19 percent (approximately 890,000 students) received language arts instruction, and

- 11 percent (approximately 520,000 students) received instruction for children with limited English proficiency.

These figures are roughly comparable with the service patterns for school year 1981-82, when 72 percent of all program participants received compensatory instruction in reading, 42 percent received supplementary mathematics instruction, 20 percent received language arts instruction, and 11 percent received services for limited English proficient students (E.1).

Over the four years for which complete information on funding and services are available (school years 1979-80 through 1982-83), the number of participating students and staff has decreased. The numbers of children receiving reading and mathematics instruction, however, increased between school years 1981-82 and 1982-83 (see the next section in this chapter).

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness: (continued)

The decrease in students served has been proportionally smaller than the decrease in staff. (The ratio of full-time equivalent staff to students was 1:30 in school year 1982-83 compared to 1:27 in 1979-80.) Also, the decrease was proportionally smaller for the nonpublic students served than for the public school students served.

While resources declined annually between school years 1979-80 and 1982-83, program funding increased significantly since then. It is likely that student participation and staffing have also increased since school year 1982-83, though such information is not currently available.

Table 2 shows percentage changes in funding, students, and staff from school years 1979-80 through 1984-85.

Table 2

Percentage Changes in Funding, Students, and Staff
from School Year 1979-80 through 1984-85

| School Years | Funding | Total Students | Nonpublic Students | Staff |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1979-80 to 1980-81 | - 1.6 % | - 1.9 % | 12.4 % | - 4.2 % |
| 1980-81 to 1981-82 | - 4.4 % | - 8.3 % | - 14.1 % | - 9.2 % |
| 1981-82 to 1982-83* | - 1.8 % | - 1.9 % | - 0.7 % | - 7.0 % |
| 1982-83 to 1983-84 | + 6.4 % | ** | ** | ** |
| 1983-84 to 1984-85 | + 10.1 % | ** | ** | ** |

* 1981-82 data were used to estimate 1982-83 data for Michigan.

** Data on student participation and staffing for this year will appear in future editions of the Annual Evaluation Report.

Reading and Mathematics Services: The number of children who received reading and mathematics services in school year 1982-83 increased from the previous year, even though the number of children served by the program overall declined. Table 3 provides a four-year analysis of the numbers of children who received Chapter 1 reading and mathematics instruction.

Table 3

Number and Percent of Students Receiving Reading and Math Instruction

| | Reading | | Math | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| School Year | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 1979-80 | 4,189,633 | 78% | 2,478,828 | 46% |
| 1980-81 | 3,831,871 | 73% | 2,215,923 | 42% |
| 1981-82 | 3,472,484 | 72% | 2,055,015 | 42% |
| 1982-83 | 3,519,826 | 74% | 2,156,082 | 45% |

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness: (continued)

Reading and mathematics services varied widely across States, as measured by the number of States that reported achievement information by subject matter and grade level. For instance, for school year 1982-83, 39 States reported reading achievement results in grade 2, but only 21 States reported grade 12 reading. As many as 47 States provided information on mathematics achievement in the elementary grades, while only 26 States reported on grade 12 mathematics.

Staffing: Local project funds supported 156,500 full-time-equivalent staff positions during the 1982-83 school term, compared to 172,850 in 1981-82. As in prior years, the majority of staff (approximately 83 percent) were either teachers or teacher aides.

Federal Monitoring: During FY 1984, the Department conducted 25 onsite State reviews of the LEA grant program portion of Chapter 1. At least two LEAs in each of these States were also visited in order to review ongoing programs for compliance with the statute and regulations. The Office of Elementary and Secondary Education reported the following major summary findings of the reviews (E.2):

- Most States administer Chapter 1 much the same as they administered Title I.
- Local Chapter 1 programs are generally in compliance with the Chapter 1 requirements.
- Most States have developed comprehensive guidelines for use by LEAs in administering Chapter 1. Additionally, SEAs provide assistance to their LEAs on a wide range of topics designed to improve and upgrade their programs. Most of the States have developed and implemented effective procedures for onsite monitoring of their LEA programs.
- States are increasingly using evaluation data to target program improvement efforts and to identify areas requiring technical assistance.
- Most States actively encourage parent involvement in Chapter 1.

As a result of audits conducted by the Department, eleven final determination letters on costs of the States' administration of their Title I and Chapter 1 programs were issued. The auditors questioned or disallowed costs totaling $4.5 million; subsequently the Department's determinations required States to refund $3.7 million. Principal violations in the audits included: failure to document salaries of employees paid from more than one program, use of Federal funds to supplant regular State and local funds, and use of Federal funds as general aid (E.2).

(For additional information on State and local program administration, see the FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report, which described the findings of two major studies of program administration under Title I, the Description of District Practices and the Study of State Management Practices.)

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness: (continued)

Students Served: The States reported that Chapter 1 students had the following achievement characteristics:

- In elementary school reading projects, the "average" entering Chapter 1 student scored at the 24th percentile.
- In elementary school mathematics projects, the "average" entering Chapter 1 student scored at the 29th percentile.
- Thus, the "average" Chapter 1 reading student appeared to be more educationally disadvantaged than the "average" Chapter 1 mathematics student.
- In high school reading projects, the "average" entering student scored at approximately the 19th percentile.
- In high school mathematics projects, the "average" entering student scored at approximately the 26th percentile.
- Thus, the "average" high school student who received Chapter 1 mathematics instruction appeared to be less educationally disadvantaged than the "average" high school student who received reading instruction.
- High school Chapter 1 students are further behind their peers than are elementary school Chapter 1 students.

In general, these findings are very similar to those reported for the previous three years of Title I/Chapter 1.

Program Effectiveness: The reading and mathematics achievement results of Chapter 1 students in grades two through twelve are presented in Table 4. These results are from school districts that used an annual (i.e. spring-to-spring or fall-to-fall) test cycle for students who participated in Chapter 1 programs.

In all but two cases, States reported gains in the percentile standings of participants between the pretest and the posttest. However, these results should be interpreted with caution, since the evaluations may contain small biases of from one to two Normal Curve Equivalent units (NCEs), particularly in the lower grades 2/.

Overall, achievement results for school year 1982-83 were about the same as those found in school years 1979-80 through 1981-82. They are consistent with earlier studies and reports on the effectiveness of compensatory education, which generally assert that:

- Achievement gains are made in most (but not all) grades, but they are modest, with greater gains made in the earlier grades.
- Gains are not usually sustained after program services are discontinued, particularly in mathematics. (State-reported achievement data are collected for one school year at a time, and do not generally address the "sustained effects" issue. See Section III below.)

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness: (continued)

Table 4 reports achievement data from all States except Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Texas. Again, the achievement results for students tested on an annual basis are not corrected for possible bias and should be interpreted with caution.

Table 4

Reading and Mathematics Achievement Results for Students Tested on an Annual (Fall-to-Fall or Spring-to-Spring) Schedule During the 1982-83 School Year

| | Reading | | | | Mathematics | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Weighted Number | Percentile | | NCE 2/ Gain | Weighted Number | Percentile | | NCE 2/ Gain |
| Grade | Tested | Pretest | Posttest | Score | Tested | Pretest | Posttest | Score |
| 2 | 70,901 | 31 | 32 | 1.0 | 46,036 | 38 | 42 | 1.9 |
| 3 | 84,606 | 25 | 30 | 2.9 | 55,990 | 32 | 37 | 2.7 |
| 4 | 94,223 | 24 | 28 | 2.6 | 63,539 | 29 | 33 | 2.8 |
| 5 | 96,384 | 24 | 28 | 3.3 | 67,646 | 28 | 35 | 4.7 |
| 6 | 85,966 | 24 | 29 | 3.6 | 60,820 | 27 | 36 | 5.2 |
| 7 | 47,680 | 24 | 28 | 2.3 | 31,842 | 25 | 32 | 4.7 |
| 8 | 43,551 | 22 | 26 | 3.1 | 30,598 | 26 | 32 | 3.8 |
| 9 | 22,277 | 22 | 26 | 2.8 | 16,463 | 28 | 32 | 2.3 |
| 10 | 13,308 | 19 | 21 | 1.6 | 8,833 | 26 | 28 | 1.4 |
| 11 | 9,758 | 20 | 20 | -0.6 | 7,048 | 27 | 28 | 0.9 |
| 12 | 6,786 | 17 | 16 | -0.3 | 5,044 | 26 | 27 | 0.3 |

Other Reported Data: States reported data separately for students tested on a fall-to-spring test cycle and for those tested on an annual cycle. Despite the substantial bias that can be introduced by fall-to-spring testing, the majority of students -- about two-thirds in school year 1982-83 -- were tested fall-to-spring.

Fall-to-spring achievement testing typically indicates gains substantially and consistently higher than those indicated by annual testing. Fall-to-spring testing may overestimate true gains by as many as five to six NCEs in the lower grades. The reason for this disparity is as follows: school districts typically test their Chapter 1 participants in September, at the beginning of the new school year, while national standardized test norms are usually based on October or November testing. Early testing results in overestimating true achievement gains because fall-to-spring test results do not take into account students' rapid, natural achievement growth at the beginning of each new school year. Annual testing, by contrast, minimizes the likelihood of such overestimates.

Table 5 illustrates the problem of overestimation of achievement gains that typically results when students are tested on a fall-to-spring test cycle. The data in Table 5 were reported by States and local school districts.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness: (continued)

The Department has cautioned States and school districts, through various reports and through the Chapter 1 evaluation Technical Assistance Centers, about the potential misuse of fall-to-spring test results as an estimate of Chapter 1 program impact. Nonetheless, we are presenting Table 5 because the majority of data reported by States continues to be based on fall-to-spring testing, and because the resulting gains displayed in Table 5 provide a dramatic contrast with the more credible estimates of program effectiveness provided in Table 4. The Congress should use great caution in interpreting claims of effectiveness for Chapter 1 programs whenever the evaluations are based on fall-to-spring results.

Table 5

Reported Results from Fall-to-Spring Testing for Reading and Mathematics During the 1982-83 School Year, Illustrating Typical Overestimation of Gains

| | Reading | | | | Mathematics | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Weighted Number | Percentile | | NCE 2/ Gain | Weighted Number | Percentile | | NCE 2/ Gain |
| Grade | Tested | Pretest | Posttest | Score | Tested | Pretest | Posttest | Score |
| 2 | 221,595 | 21 | 36 | 9.6 | 80,769 | 22 | 41 | 11.4 |
| 3 | 193,758 | 20 | 32 | 7.7 | 88,218 | 22 | 38 | 9.8 |
| 4 | 177,948 | 20 | 30 | 6.9 | 91,629 | 21 | 36 | 9.4 |
| 5 | 165,751 | 20 | 29 | 6.2 | 93,572 | 22 | 35 | 8.1 |
| 6 | 141,857 | 20 | 29 | 5.9 | 78,445 | 23 | 35 | 7.8 |
| 7 | 95,755 | 20 | 28 | 5.0 | 50,376 | 25 | 34 | 5.9 |
| 8 | 74,583 | 20 | 27 | 4.8 | 38,897 | 24 | 32 | 5.5 |
| 9 | 46,149 | 19 | 26 | 5.0 | 24,125 | 20 | 29 | 5.9 |
| 10 | 26,957 | 17 | 23 | 4.4 | 11,654 | 20 | 26 | 3.6 |
| 11 | 16,276 | 17 | 21 | 3.4 | 5,591 | 17 | 21 | 4.8 |
| 12 | 9,622 | 18 | 21 | 2.5 | 3,336 | 21 | 27 | 4.5 |

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

- The Department has proposed legislation for additional technical changes to the Chapter 1 legislation in FY 1985. The Chapter 1 formula now requires that the Department use data collected in 1975 as part of the Survey of Income and Education (SIE) and the criteria of poverty associated with the 1970 census in the Department's distribution of Chapter 1 funds. The proposed changes would eliminate the use of the outdated SIE data and enable the Department to use the criteria of poverty associated with the most recent (1980) census in allocating Chapter 1 funds.

- The Administration has proposed legislation to permit LEAs and States to implement Chapter 1 as a voucher program. Parents of educationally disadvantaged children selected for participation would receive vouchers for compensatory education services, in public or private schools.

- The Department will publish final regulations to implement the 1983 ECIA Technical Amendments in FY 1985.

- The Department will further emphasize program monitoring in FY 1985. Onsite reviews in 30 States are being planned, with more in-depth monitoring of specific program areas.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section Above:

1. State Performance Reports, 1979-80 through 1982-83.

2. State audit reports, U.S. Department of Education.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

The following studies are in progress or are scheduled to begin in FY 1985:

- A "National Assessment of Compensatory Education" was mandated in the 1983 ECIA Technical Amendments. The National Institute of Education will manage this activity, which will both re-examine educational effects of compensatory education programs on participating children as well as develop a national profile of Chapter 1 programs. Interim reports are due to Congress in January and July of 1986, with a final report due in January, 1987.

To supplement State-provided achievement information, the Department supported a study of the "Sustained Achievement of Chapter 1 Students":

- The Chapter 1 Evaluation Technical Assistance Centers examined the achievement patterns of Title I/Chapter 1 students. The primary purpose of the study was to examine two-year patterns of gain or decline for students who received Chapter 1 instruction in both years, or only in the first or second year. The final report from this study will be available in March, 1985.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: John Staehle, (202) 245-3081

Program studies: Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401

Notes

1. Excludes Special Incentive Grants, and State-operated programs (which include the Migrant Education Program, the Program for Neglected or Delinquent Children, and the Program for Handicapped Children).

2. NCEs are a form of standardized test scores based on percentiles and used by school districts, States and ED for purposes of aggregation and reporting. There would be no change in NCEs when a group has stayed at exactly the same percentile from pretest to posttest; thus, an NCE gain indicates an increase in the percentile standing of a group, and an NCE loss indicates a decrease in a group's relative standing.

## MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM (CHAPTER 1, ECIA)
## FORMULA GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES TO MEET THE SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN
## (CFDA No. 84.011)

### I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, Chapter 1, P.L. 97-35 as amended, (20 U.S.C. 3851). (Expires September 30, 1987).

Funding since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $245,000,000 | $245,000,000 1/ |
| 1981 | 266,400,000 | 266,400,000 |
| 1982 | 255,744,000 | 255,744,000 |
| 1983 | 255,744,000 | 255,744,000 |
| 1984 | 258,024,000 | 258,024,000 |

Purpose: To establish and improve programs to meet the special educational needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers or fishers.

Eligibility: A State education agency (SEA) may apply for a grant to operate a State migrant education program directly, through subgrants to local education agencies (LEAs), or through arrangements with public or nonprofit private agencies. Two or more SEAs may apply jointly for a grant to support a migrant education program for eligible children in those States. Also, an SEA or a group of SEAs may apply for a grant to operate a program for interstate and intrastate coordination of migrant education activities among SEAs, LEAs, and other agencies.

The following table indicates the number of full-time equivalent students registered on the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) since 1977. These counts serve as the basis for program funding. One full-time equivalent equals 365 days of enrollment on the MSRTS. A count of the actual number of students identified as eligible for services and enrolled on the MSRTS is also shown.

| Calendar Year | Full-time Equivalent Students (ages 5-17) | Number of Eligible Students (Under 21 Years of Age) |
|---|---|---|
| 1977 | 296,430 | 467,796 |
| 1978 | 323,501 | 494,417 |
| 1979 | 366,460 | 522,154 |
| 1980 | 398,798 | 550,253 |
| 1981 | 417,298 | 577,483 |
| 1982 | 426,729 | 593,042 |
| 1983 | 407,650 | 566,714 |

On December 8, 1983, Congress enacted technical amendments to ECIA (P.L. 98-211) that amended Section 555(b) of ECIA to require that the Department continue to use the definitions of "currently migratory child," "migratory agricultural worker" and "migratory fisherman" which were in effect in the Title I regulations as of June 30, 1982.

P.L. 98-211 also amended the program's basic application requirements contained in Section 142(a)(3) of Title I, so that, except for the continued need for parent advisory councils, these requirements conformed to the basic requirements for the LEA basic formula grant program contained in Sections 556 and 558 of ECIA Chapter 1.

On June 12, 1984, Congress enacted P.L. 98-312, which modified the definition of children of migratory fisherman to include children of persons who "reside in a school district of more than 18,000 square miles and migrate a distance of 20 miles or more to temporary residences to engage in fishing activity."

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During Fiscal Year 1984, the Department's principal objectives for this program were:

- To monitor ongoing projects and award grants for school year 1984-85 projects.
- To issue final program regulations reflecting the changes required by ECIA Chapter 1.
- To develop procedures for data collection and analysis, as required by the technical amendments to ECIA Chapter 1.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department awarded 51 Basic grants to the States ranging from $20,022 to $73,650,977. It also awarded sixteen Interstate and Intrastate Coordination grants to eleven different States at an average cost of $130,000.
- The Department conducted ten onsite State program reviews.
- The large volume of comments on the December 3, 1982 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, combined with further changes in the statute, caused delay and subsequent revision of the final regulations for the program. Final regulations are expected to be published in Fiscal Year 1985.
- The Department developed a draft form to collect migrant education performance and achievement data from the States.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Benefits and Effectiveness: No new information is available. Results from studies completed prior to Fiscal Year 1984 were discussed in the Annual Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1983.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

During Fiscal Year 1984, the following changes were proposed to alter the scope and effect of the program:

Proposed Change in the Program Statute. On February 8, 1984, the Department proposed a statutory change to reduce the period of eligibility for "formerly migratory" children from five years to two years. The purpose of this proposed change was to ensure that the program focus funds on students whose education has most recently been affected by their mobility.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Annual Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1983. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation. Washington, D.C., 1983.

## F. Other Supporting Data: No additional information is available.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Louis J. McGuinness, (202) 245-2722

Program Studies: James J. English, (202) 245-9401

### Notes

1. Starting in FY 1980, Congress changed the authorized funding level of each Title I State-operated program from "fully-funded" to a specific amount. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 further capped the authorization for the State-operated programs at 14.6 percent of the total appropriated for Chapter 1.

# FORMULA GRANTS TO STATES FOR NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.013)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), enacted as part of Subtitle D of Title V of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 (20 USC 2781) as amended. (Expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $32,391,655 | $32,391,655 |
| 1981 | 33,975,000 | 33,975,000 |
| 1982 | 32,616,000 | 32,616,000 |
| 1983 | 32,616,000 | 32,616,000 |
| 1984 | 32,616,000 | 32,616,000 |

Purpose: To provide financial assistance to meet the special educational needs of children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children or in adult correctional institutions, for whom a State agency is directly reponsible for providing free public education. The programs and projects provided must be designed to support educational services supplemental to the basic education of such children which must be provided by the State agency.

Eligibility: State agencies directly responsible for providing free public education to children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, or to children in adult correctional institutions, may receive grants.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objective for this program was the issuance of final regulations for State Agency programs under ECIA Chapter 1.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments:

o Regulations were developed and submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for clearance.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: States were required to submit information on the number of students served by the program during the 1982-83 school year. Based on reports received from 48 States, D.C. and Puerto Rico, ED estimates that over 56,000 students were served at an average cost of approximately $525 per student (E.1).

Program Effectiveness: Each State education agency is required to conduct an evaluation at least once every two years and to make public the results of that evaluation.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. A Summary of 1982-83 State Evaluation Reports, U.S. Department of Education (available in early 1985).

## F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are in progress. ED plans to conduct a study during FY 1985.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: John Staehle, (202) 245-3081

Program studies: Judith Anderson, (202) 245-9401

# CONSOLIDATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION--CHAPTER 2 STATE BLOCK GRANT (CFDA No. 84.151)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, enacted as part of Subtitle D of Title V of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35, as amended. (Expires September 30, 1987)

Funding Since 1982:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1982 | $589,368,000 | $442,176,000 |
| 1983 | 589,368,000 | 450,655,000 |
| 1984 | 589,368,000 | 450,655,000 |

Purpose: To assist State and local educational agencies to improve elementary and secondary education, through consolidation of 42 elementary and secondary education programs into a single authorization. The goal is to reduce paperwork and assign responsibility for the design and implementation of Chapter 2 programs to local educational agencies (LEAs). State educational agencies (SEAs) have the basic responsibility for the administration and supervision of Chapter 2 programs.

Eligibility: All States including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico; and the Insular Areas including American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

State Assurances: State applications must (1) describe the allocation of funds reserved for State use among authorized purposes, including funds required to provide equitable benefits for children enrolled in private schools; and (2) provide for continuing consultation with an appointed advisory committee, for annual evaluations of the supported programs, for the maintenance of records required for fiscal audits and program evaluations, for assurances of compliance with Chapter 2 requirements and for public notice and dissemination of certain information.

Local Assurances: In their applications to their States, LEAs must (1) describe the allocation of funds among authorized purposes; (2) assure compliance with the requirements of Chapter 2, including the participation of private school children; (3) agree to keep records for fiscal audit and program evaluation purposes and provide such information to the SEA; and (4) consult with parents, teachers and administrative personnel, and other appropriate groups regarding the allocation of funds for Chapter 2 programs and the design, planning and implementation of Chapter 2 programs.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives for this program were:

- Publish program regulations to implement the technical amendments to Chapter 2, enacted in December 1983.
- Conduct on-site program reviews to obtain information about State administration of the program and to recommend changes if the State is not complying with the statute or the regulations.
- Provide technical assistance to State Chapter 2 Directors about program administration and program evaluation.
- Receive State applications and/or amendments, approve amended State funding distribution criteria for the 1984-85 school year, and issue grant awards by July 1, 1984.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department published proposed regulations implementing the technical amendments on July 10, 1984.
- It also conducted program reviews in 25 States and sent reports of the findings to each State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
- Department staff participated in a regional meeting for midwest Chapter 2 Directors (November 1983), in a National Chapter 2 meeting on program evaluation (February 1984), and in meetings of the Chapter 2 National Steering Committee (July, September 1984)
- The Department processed all State applications, amendments, and/or distribution criteria and issued grant awards by July 1, 1984.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Funds Distributed for State Use: During Program Year 1982-83, the first year of program operations, States reserved for their own use a total of $83,092,771 (or 19.0% of the total). Of this amount States allocated 12.9% for administration, 7.4% for Subchapter A (Basic Skills), 73.6% for Subchapter B (Educational Improvement & Support), and 6.1% for Subchapter C (Special Projects). States allocated the majority of support (51.6%) to "Improving Planning/ Management/ Implementation of Educational Programs," a purpose under Subchapter B (E.2). Although some States amended their spending plans for program year 1983-84, this information remains substantially the same for the second year of the program.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Funds Distributed to Local Educational Agencies: In 1982 State formulas distributed about 70% to LEAs based on enrollment, and over half used two or fewer high-cost factors (usually economic need or sparsity or presence of exceptional students) (E.2). Subsequent changes to their formulas have not substantially changed these findings.

LEAs received a total of $352,009,097 in program year 1982-83 under State-developed formulas. Based on information from 33 States (E.3), LEAs allocated 84.8% of the funds to Subchapter B, with Subchapters A and C receiving 6.0% and 9.2% of the funds respectively. They budgeted a total of $35,096,861 for the purchase of library resources, textbooks, and instructional materials; and an additional $50,035,790 for instructional equipment. We doubt that spending patterns changed much for FY 1984.

Preliminary findings from the second year of case study work in nine states (E.4) provided information on LEAs' administrative and programmatic responses to the Chapter 2 program. General tendencies, based on interviews in approximately 100 districts during program year 1983-84, included:

- Planning for Chapter 2 has been integrated into ongoing district mechanisms. Stronger planning mechanisms included greater parental involvement.
- Former participating districts in the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) did not respond similarly to Chapter 2. Some continued to support former ESAA activities with Chapter 2 funds; others used those funds for different activities.
- Even among districts that lost money under Chapter 2, the increased flexibility and local control of decisions make Chapter 2 more attractive than the programs it superseded.
- Chapter 2 programs are used to support, in whole or in part, high priority programs. Chapter 2 funds enable LEAs to implement a priority more quickly or with broader coverage than would otherwise occur.
- Computer-related purchases are directly related to district goals and tend to include hardware and software purchases and teacher training in planned sequences.

Initial Monitoring Findings: On-site monitoring of States' Chapter 2 administrative practices in 25 States during FY 1984 (E.5) found:

- Overall, State program administration complied with statutory requirements.
- The two most frequent weaknesses were: (1) SEAs' lack of on-site LEA monitoring, and (2) SEAs' failure to check LEAs' compliance with requirements for private school participation.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Funding Effects on Urban/Large LEAs: As a continuation to an analysis reported last year of the fiscal effects of Chapter 2 on the 28 largest cities and districts (E.6), the Department supported an analysis of second year Chapter 2 funding (E.7). Examining four years of funding (two years prior to and two years of Chapter 2) for the nation's largest cities and school districts, the analysts found smaller cuts in the two years since Chapter 2 than in the year prior to its enactment. The reductions amounted to:

o 34% during the last 2 years of antecedent funding;

o 29% between the last antecedent year and the first year of Chapter 2; and

o 4% from the first to second year under Chapter 2.

Eleven of the 28 districts lost funds under both years of the block grant. The dollar reductions are over ten times the size of the gains (11 districts gained a total of $2.7 million while 17 districts lost a total of $31.4 million), but no large district suffered a cut in any year greater than about 1% of its budget. The main determinants of adverse fiscal effects were the presence and size of an antecedent ESAA grant.

Desegregation Impacts: The most recent fiscal effects study (E.7) reported that desegregation-related activities supported with Chapter 2 funds were planned in program year 1984-85 by 16 of 24 districts which had ESAA grants in FY 1981 and two of four districts which did not receive ESAA funds. Desegregation-related projects averaged 19% of Chapter 2 funding in these districts, ranging from 0% (in ten districts) to 100% (in two districts).

Private School Participation Under Chapter 2: A recent paper (E.8) on funding for services to private school students and LEA administrative practices concerning private school participation revealed that the percentage of funds used for services to private school students in 44 large LEAs ranged from 2 to 26%, with a mean of 13.5%. In all but 6 of the 44 LEAs, the percentage of funds spent on private school students was less than the percentage enrollment of such students. On another item 16 of 29 LEAs indicated that funds received under their States' high cost factors were not shared with private school students, contrary to statutory requirements.

The Department lacks good information on how or whether LEAs are fulfilling their responsibility to ensure private schools' nondiscriminatory practices for Chapter 2 supported activities.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Program Effectiveness: At this time it is not possible to report on the program's effects on the improvement of education. States are required to prepare annual evaluation reports beginning with the 1983-84 school year, which the Department will receive and analyze during FY 1985. In addition, interim results from a national evaluation study of the Chapter 2 program will be available in FY 1985.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C:

1. How SEAs Plan To Expend the Block Grant Funds Reserved for Their Own Use, Department of Education, Washington, D.C., April 1983.

2. An Examination of Criteria Used in the Distribution of Funds to Local Educational Agencies, Department of Education, Washington, D.C., August, 1982.

3. How LEAs Plan To Use Their Block Grants, Department of Education, Washington, D.C., April 1983.

4. Preliminary Findings From a Study of the Implementation and Effects of Chapter 2 of ECIA in Nine States, E.H. White and Co., Washington, D.C., November 1984.

5. FY 1984 State Monitoring Findings, Remarks at Chapter 2 National Steering Committee Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, July 1984.

6. Fiscal Effects of the Chapter 2, ECIA Block Grant on the Largest Districts and Cities, Advanced Technology, Reston, Virginia, June 1983.

7. Big Districts and the Block Grant: A Cross-time Assessment of the Fiscal Impacts, Richard K. Jung and Robert M. Stonehill, Paper presented at the annual AERA meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 1984.

8. Setting the Record Straight: What ED Knows About Private School Participation Under Chapter 2, Department of Education, Washington, D.C., September 1984.

## F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

The following studies are under way:

| Anticipated Completion Date | Title of Study |
|---|---|
| December 1984 | Nine State Case Studies of the Implementation of ECIA Chapter 2 |
| December 1984 | Report of OIG's Chapter 2 Systems Reviews in Ten States |
| July 1985 | Syntheses of States' FY 1984 Chapter 2 Evaluation Reports |
| September 1985 | Uses of Chapter 2 Funds by SEAs and LEAs |
| November 1985 | A Study of Local Operations Under Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act |

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Allen J. King, (202) 245-7965.

Program studies: Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401.

# GENERAL ASSISTANCE TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
(No CFDA number)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 95-561, Section 1524. (Expires September 30, 1988)

Funding Since 1980:

| Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 5,000,000 | $ 3,000,000 |
| 1981 | 5,000,000 | 2,700,000 |
| 1982 | 2,700,000 | 1,920,000 |
| 1983 | 2,700,000 | 1,920,000 |
| 1984 | 2,700,000 | 1,920,000 |
| 1985 | 5,000,000 | 2,700,000 |

Purpose: To provide general assistance to improve public education in the Virgin Islands.

Eligibility: Only the Virgin Islands is eligible for funds. As a direct entitlement program, it is administered by a signed agreement between the U.S. Department of Education and the Department of Education of the Virgin Islands.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

The FY 1984 application from the Virgin Islands identified the following objectives:

- To complete activities related to the construction and renovation of two curriculum centers and other educational facilities.
- To correct an asbestos health hazard in all public educational facilities.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

Full implementation of the FY 1984 objectives has been delayed because funds were withheld pending the final decision in United States of America v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago. However, the Department authorized use of FY 1985 money to fund the following 1984 activities:

- Renovation of classrooms, educational facilities, and school offices accommodating approximately 1,000 educators or support staff and 12,600 students.
- Removal and replacement of asbestos on roofs of 16 educational facilities.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

No new information.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The program has been reauthorized through FY 1988 by Public Law 98-511.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program grantee files.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are under way.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Jack Simmons, (202) 245-8506

Program Studies: Rhonda L. Lewis, (202) 245-9401

# CIVIL RIGHTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING
(CFDA No. 84.004)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 88-352, Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 2000c-2000c-5). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | Indefinite | $45,675,000 |
| 1981 | " | 37,111,000 |
| 1982 | $ 37,100,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 1983 | 37,100,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 1984 | 37,100,000 | 24,000,000 |

Purpose: To provide technical assistance, training, and advisory services to school districts that are coping with the special educational problems caused by the desegregation of their schools with respect to race, sex, and national origin.

Eligibility: State educational agencies (SEAs), school boards, public agencies, private nonprofit agencies, and institutions of higher education are eligible to apply for a grant. Grants may be made for local educational agency (LEA) projects, SEA projects, Desegregation Assistance Centers (DACs), and Training Institutes. Local educational agencies and Training Institutes have not been funded since Fiscal Year 1981. Most DAC awards are made to institutions of higher education, although any public agency (except an SEA or LEA) or private, nonprofit organization may apply.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During Fiscal Year 1984, the Department's principal objectives for this program were:

- To increase the number of SEAs participating in this program, increasing their capacity for assisting desegregating school districts within their States.

- To strengthen cooperation between DACs and SEAs.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- o Regarding the first objective listed above, there was a 5.3% decrease in the number of SEA awards made between FY 1983 and 1984. The reason for the decrease is because four States that received awards in FY 83 in the areas of race and/or national origin did not meet the program's criteria in FY 1984.

- o Each DAC included in its new application package a strategy to meet the objective of strengthening cooperation between the DACs and SEAs.

## C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Grants Awarded: The following table presents data on Fiscal Year 1984 Title IV awards (E.1).

Table 1

| Category | Total Applications | Total Awards | Percent of Applicants Funded | Total Obligation | Average Award |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Race | | | | | |
| DAC | 22 | 17 | 77 | $ 4,521,853 | $265,991 |
| SEA | 33 | 30 | 91 | 4,533,224 | 151,107 |
| Sex | | | | | |
| DAC | 16 | 12 | 75 | 2,555,984 | 212,998 |
| SEA | 44 | 44 | 100 | 3,935,004 | 89,432 |
| National Origin | | | | | |
| DAC | 13 | 11 | 85 | 2,922,163 | 265,651 |
| SEA | 35 | 32 | 91 | 5,531,772 | 172,868 |
| TOTAL | 163 | 146 | | $24,000,000 | |

In Fiscal Year 1984, 146 awards were made. Of these, 106 were to SEAs and 40 were to DACs. Approximately $14 million was used for grants to SEAs and $10 million for grants to DACs. Because of litigation in the case United States of America v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago, the Title IV program received $3.1 million of the FY 1984 funds and $20.9 million of the FY 1985 funds to support FY 1984 desegregation activities. At such time as the Federal District Court releases the frozen FY 1984 funds, accounting adjustments will be made so that the 1985 Title IV awards can be made.

Types of Assistance: SEAs and DACs provided technical assistance in areas relating to desegregation on the basis of race, sex, and national origin such as assisting in the preparation and adoption of race desegregation plans, in the development of programs to increase understanding of public school personnel concerning the problems of sex bias, and in the development of instructional programs for students whose dominant language is not English.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Department will continue to emphasize capacity-building within SEAs.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program grantee files.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

Phase I of the Desegregation Assistance Centers (DACs) study by Advanced Technology, Inc. began in October, 1984.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Curtis Coates, (202) 245-8484

Program studies: Rhonda Lewis, (202) 245-9401

# FOLLOW THROUGH - GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES AND OTHER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE NON-PROFIT AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS TO PROVIDE COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES TO LOW-INCOME CHILDREN IN THE PRIMARY GRADES

(CFDA No. 84.014)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Follow Through Act; Subchapter C of Chapter 8 of Subtitle A of Title VI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-35). Section 561(a) of Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 consolidates Follow Through into the Chapter 2 Block Grant program on a phased basis (20 U.S.C. 3811). (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 85,000,000 | $ 44,250,000 |
| 1981 | 100,000,000 | 26,250,000 |
| 1982 | 44,300,000 | 19,440,000 |
| 1983 | 22,150,000 | 19,440,000 |
| 1984 | 14,767,000 | 14,767,000 |

Purpose: To assist the overall development of children enrolled in kindergarten through third grade from low-income families and to amplify the educational gains made by such children in Head Start and other similar preschool programs by (1) implementing innovative educational approaches; (2) providing comprehensive support services; (3) conducting the programs in a context of effective community service and parent involvement; and (4) documenting those models found to be effective.

Eligibility: Grants since 1972 have been made only on a continuation basis; i.e., to be eligible for a Follow Through grant an applicant must have received a Follow Through grant in the preceding fiscal year.

Program Activities: Follow Through provides discretionary grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to operate projects; to institutions of higher education and regional laboratories to develop and sponsor the instructional models used in Follow Through sites; and to selected local projects to conduct demonstration activities. For each project, an LEA is required to use an innovative instructional model; provide comprehensive services and special activities in the areas of physical and mental health, social services, and nutrition; and conduct the program with effective community service and parental involvement. Some large districts use more than one model and thus have multiple projects. Nineteen of the 68 projects participating in Follow Through also function as Resource Centers and provide demonstration services.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

- To provide timely review of grant continuation proposals.
- To encourage presentation of individual project data to the ED Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP).

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- During FY 1984 awards were made to 60 LEAs, 15 model sponsors, and 19 resource centers.
- Applications for review by the JDRP are being evaluated by program staff.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope: Follow Through currently serves approximately 22,000 children at about $671.00 per child. In FY 1984, the program committed funds as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 68 Projects at 60 LEAs | $12,460,699 |
| 15 Sponsors | 1,244,187 |
| 19 Resource Centers | 1,062,114 |
| | $14,767,000 |

Full grants for the 1984-85 school year have not been awarded because of litigation between the Department and the Board of Education of the City of Chicago. The program received $2.4 million of the FY 1984 appropriation and $10 million of the FY 1985 appropriation to continue supporting 1984 Follow Through activities. The remaining $2.4 million of FY 1984 funds will be released pending the final court decision.

Effectiveness: No current information is available.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

None. The program is scheduled to be phased into the Chapter 2 block grant program.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above:

1. Follow Through Grantee Reports, 1984.

### F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

## III. Response to GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

## Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Eugene Thurman, (202) 245-9846

Program studies: Rhonda Lewis, (202) 245-9401

# SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS (IMPACT AID): MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS
(CFDA NO. 84.041)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: School Assistance In Federally Affected Areas Act, P.L. 81-874, (20 U.S.C. 236), as amended by P.L. 95-561, 97-35, 98-94 and 98-511 (Expires October 1, 1988).

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $1,404,900,000 | $792,000,000 1/ |
| 1981 | 1,487,700,000 | 706,750,000 |
| 1982 | 455,000,000 | 437,800,000 |
| 1983 | 455,000,000 | 460,200,000 2/ |
| 1984 | 565,000,000 | 580,000,000 3/ |

Purpose: To help compensate school districts for the cost of educating children when enrollment and the availability of revenues from local sources have been adversely affected by Federal activities, and to assist local educational agencies affected by natural disasters.

Eligibility: Local educational agencies (LEAs) may qualify under any of the following provisions:

- o Partial loss of tax base (10 percent or more of assessed value of real property) as a result of the acquisition since 1938 of real property by the United States (Section 2).
- o Enrollment of children who reside on Federal property and whose parents are in the uniformed services or work on Federal property ("a" children, Section 3).
- o Enrollment of children who reside on or whose parents work on Federal property or are in the uniformed services ("b" children, Section 3).
- o Location in a Presidentially declared major disaster area (Section 7).

Current Formula: The following criteria were in effect for FY 1984 payments:

- o If "a" pupils represented 20 percent or more of an LEA's average daily attendance (ADA), then payment for "a" pupils was 100 percent of the LEA's entitlement;

Current Formula (Continued)

- If "a" pupils represented less than 20 percent of an LEA's ADA, then payment for "a" pupils was prorated from the LEA's full entitlement.
- If "b" pupils represented 20 percent or more of an LEA's average daily attendance (ADA), then payment for "b" pupils was 50 percent of the LEA's entitlement.
- If "b" pupils represented less than 20 percent of an LEA's ADA, then payment for "b" pupils was prorated from the LEA's full entitlement.
- Payments based on "a" and/or "b" children must have exceeded $5,000 in order to be paid.

Restrictions on Funds: For those districts receiving Section 3 payments for handicapped children of military personnel and handicapped children residing on Indian lands, the funds must be used to meet the needs of those children. Also, school districts serving Indian children must adopt policies and procedures assuring that there is parental involvement in planning appropriate programs for these students. In general, funds are commingled with State, local, and other resources that are used for general operating expenses which benefit all students.

Administrative Responsibility for Section 6 Funds: The Department of Education retains administrative responsibility for Section 6 even though funds have been appropriated to the Defense Department since 1982. Section 6 authorizes payments to Federal agencies or local educational agencies to educate children who reside on Federal property when no LEA is able, because of legal or other reasons, to provide a suitable free public education for these children.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objective with respect to this program was to implement the provisions of the Appropriations Act for FY 1984, P.L. 98-139.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

Priority funding was given to "a" districts if "a" pupils were 20 percent or more of the 1984 total ADA, as required by the law. New regulations were published governing the establishment of local contribution rates, a key factor in determining an LEA's entitlement and payment under Section 3.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: In 1984, payments were made to 1,929 school districts on behalf of 2 million federally connected children. This is compared to 1,200 districts serving 500,000 federally connected children in 1951.

Disaster Assistance: Seventy-nine LEAs were awarded approximately $24.9 million to repair damage to school facilities caused by severe storms and flooding, mud slides, high tides, and tornadoes in 1984.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

During FY 1985, the Department will be rewriting regulations for this program to clarify and simplify those currently in place.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

None.

## F. Other Supporting Data

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

### Contacts for further Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Program Operations: | Stan Kruger, (202) 245-8427 |
| Program Studies: | Fritz Edelstein, (202) 245-8638 |

### Notes

1. Includes $20 million supplemental for disaster assistance.

2. Amount provided by the 1983 Continuing Resolutions.

3. Includes $15 million supplemental for disaster assistance.

# SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS (IMPACT AID): CONSTRUCTION
(CFDA NO: 84.040)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas Act, P.L. 81-815 (20 U.S.C. 631), as amended by P.L. 95-561, 97-35, and 98-8, and 98-511 (Expires October 1, 1988).

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | indefinite | $33,000,000 |
| 1981 | indefinite | 50,000,000 |
| 1982 | $20,000,000 | 19,200,000 |
| 1983 | 20,000,000 | 80,000,000 1/ |
| 1984 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 |

Purpose: To construct and repair or provide grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) for the construction and repair of urgently needed minimum school facilities when enrollment and the availability of revenues from local sources have been adversely affected by Federal activities.

Eligibility:

- Districts that are in areas experiencing an increase in Federal activity. Eligibility is determined by the increase in the number of children residing on Federal property and/or the numbers of children who reside with a parent employed on Federal property (Section 5);
- Districts that are unable to finance the non-Federal portion of the project or where the grant project has been adversely affected by a natural disaster. (Section 8);
- Districts that are experiencing a temporary Federal impact (Section 9);
- Districts that are in States where no tax revenues of the State or any political subdivision may be expended for the free public education of children who reside on Federal property, or States where districts are not able to provide a free public education for these children. The Secretary is then authorized to make arrangements for the construction of minimum school facilities necessary for the education of these children (Section 10);
- Districts that consist mainly of Indian lands or that provide a free public education to a substantial number of children who reside on Indian lands (Section 14(a) and (b));
- Districts that consist mainly of Federal lands and that have a substantial number of inadequately housed pupils (Section 14(c));
- Districts whose buildings have been destroyed or seriously damaged by a natural disaster (Section 16).

Funding Priorities: In recent years, the Congress has adopted appropriations language that overrides the funding priorities established in the authorizing legislation. The Appropriations Act (P.L. 98-139) for FY 1984 provided specific sums for certain sections: $3,000,000 for Sections 5 and 14(c), $8,500,000 for Section 10, and $8,500,000 for Sections 14(a) and 14(b). Priority rankings are established within each section to reflect urgency of need and to ensure a systematic distribution of funds. If appropriations are not sufficient to fund all projects, applicants will remain on a waiting list until funded as long as they continue to meet eligibility requirements.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

o To continue to reduce the backlog of requests for funding of construction projects and to transfer federally owned school facilities to local authorities (Section 10).

### B. Progress and Accomplishments:

No new information.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Districts Served: From the start of this program through FY 1984, Federal assistance has been provided for over 6,604 projects, of which 343 have been in school districts serving children who reside on Indian lands.

Program Scope: For 1984 there were 29 new projects under Sections 5, 24 new projects under Section 10, and three under Sections 14(a) and 14(b).

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

1. Final regulations are now being drafted.

### E., F.

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

### Contacts for further Information

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Program Operations | Stan Kruger, | (202) 245-8427 |
| Program Studies | Fritz Edelstein, | (202) 245-8638 |

### Notes

1. Amounts provided by the 1983 Continuing Resolutions and Jobs Bill Supplemental Appropriation.

# ALLEN J. ELLENDER FELLOWSHIPS (CFDA No. 84.148)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P. L. 92-506--Joint Resolution of October 19, 1972 as amended. (Expires September 30, 1989.)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $1,000,000 | $1,000,000 |
| 1981 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |
| 1982 | 1,000,000 | 960,000 |
| 1983 | 1,000,000 | 3,000,000 1/ |
| 1984 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 |

Purpose: To make a grant to the Close Up Foundation of Washington, D.C., for fellowships to disadvantaged secondary school students and their teachers to learn about representative government and the democratic process.

Eligibility: Economically disadvantaged secondary school students and their teachers are eligible to apply for a fellowship from the Close Up Foundation. Fellowships are awarded annually on the basis of equitable geographic distribution and community interest.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

For Fiscal Year 1984, the Department's principal objective was--

- To award to the Close Up Foundation funds so that it can provide fellowships for low-income secondary school students and their teachers.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department awarded this grant in FY 1984 as scheduled.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: Fellowships under this program were made to approximately 5,250 students and teachers in 1984. These grants included costs of room, board, tuition, administration, insurance, and transportation, and averaged about $286 per participant.

The program consists of a week-long series of meetings, seminars, and workshops with members of Congress, members of the Executive and Judicial branches of government, Congressional committee staff members, lobbyists, reporters, foreign government representatives, and others. Since the

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

program began, a total of 19,317 students and teachers from 50 States, D.C., Puerto Rico, and Department of Defense Overseas schools have participated in the Washington Close Up Program. Students from schools for the hearing and visually impaired participated on a national basis.

Since 1979, in an effort to reach additional secondary school students and teachers with citizenship education programs, the Close Up Foundation has telecast Washington Seminars over Cable TV (C-SPAN). The seminars included discussions between Washington leaders and high school students, many of whom were Ellender Fellowship recipients. More than 3,500 secondary schools have access to these programs.

Close Up also publishes written materials including a Teachers Guide to C-SPAN; Current Issues, a book that examines contemporary questions; Perspectives, a book of readings on government operations with articles by leading members of Congress, representatives of the Executive and Judicial branches and others; The Washington Notebook, a workbook designed to help prepare students for their Washington experience; and U.S.-Soviet Relations.

Program Effectiveness: Findings of two previous studies were reported last year.

D., E., and F.

No new information.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program Operations: Kay Henry, (202) 472-7960
Program Effectiveness: Tetsuo Okada, (202) 245-8877

Note:

1. In 1983 the Congress appropriated a double amount in order to place the program on a forward funded basis. The appropriation for 1983 provides $1.5 million for school year 1982-83 and $1.5 million for school year 1983-84.

# INDIAN EDUCATION--FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES AND INDIAN-CONTROLLED SCHOOLS FOR THE EDUCATION OF INDIAN CHILDREN-- PART A (CFDA Nos. 84.060 and 84.072)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 92-318, Title IV, Part A, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 241aa-241ff. (Expired September 30, 1984)*

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization 1/ | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $640,297,800 | $52,000,000 |
| 1981 | 722,214,792 | 58,250,000 |
| 1982 | 667,770,717 | 54,960,000 |
| 1983 | 775,442,755 | 48,465,000 |
| 1984 | 814,200,000 | 50,900,000 |

Purpose: Part A of the Indian Education Act supports programs to address the educational and culturally related academic needs of Indian students in public schools and in reservation-based, Indian-controlled schools. Objectives for the program include: (1) improving academic performance in the basic skills; (2) reducing dropout rates and improving attendance; (3) increasing Indian parental participation in educational policymaking; and (4) helping public schools become more responsive to the needs of Indian children.

Assistance to Local Education Agencies and Tribal Schools: Part A grants are made on a formula basis to local education agencies 1/. Local education agencies (LEAs) are eligible if they enroll at least 10 Indian children or if Indian children constitute at least 50 percent of the total enrollment. These limitations do not apply to LEAs located in Alaska, California, or Oklahoma, or located on, or in proximity to an Indian reservation. Certain tribal schools are treated as LEAs and thus can receive formula grants under this program.

Assistance to Indian-Controlled Schools: The Indian-controlled schools program is authorized by a set-aside of an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the amount of the Part A formula program. Tribes and Indian organizations and certain LEAs that operate schools on or near reservations may compete in two areas: (1) for funds to start and establish a school; and (2) for funds to develop special enrichment programs that are supplemental to an already established program. Many, but not all, of these schools are also eligible for formula grants.

---

*The Indian Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511, authorizes Indian Education through October 1, 1989.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives for this program were to:

- Publish revised and simplified Indian Education Act regulations.
- Audit at least one-third of the local Part A projects, and provide technical assistance as needed to correct specific deficiencies or improve the overall effectiveness of local projects.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- New simplified regulations were published June 7, 1984.
- In 1983, 321 projects, representing 29 percent of all Part A grants to LEAs, had been audited and an Audit Report was sent to Congress in March, 1984. The audited projects were in 21 States and served an average of 261 students at a cost of $185 per pupil. (E.2)

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: In FY 1983, 1,083 grants totaling $44,031,321 were made to school districts based on total Indian enrollments of 304,790. Based on findings of the Impact Study (E.1 below), 78 percent of all Indian students enrolled in schools with Part A projects are estimated to have been direct recipients of special services funded by Part A, for an average cost per student served of $221 (E.1). An additional $4,381,392 went to 35 Indian-controlled schools serving 7,490 students.

Program Scope: The Impact Study was based on an estimated 259,735 Part A eligible students in K-12 in a sample of 865 projects funded in 1981. Students were divided almost equally among the following grade ranges: K-3 (30%); 4-6 (23.5%); 7-9 (23.5%) and 10-12 (23%). The largest proportion (44%) of the students participating in Part A projects attended schools in districts on or near reservations, while the next largest proportion (27%) attended school in other rural areas.

Others were enrolled in urban non-metropolitan (19%) and metropolitan (10%) areas (E.1).

Types of Services Provided: Most project activities are directed toward improving basic skills, cultural awareness or student attitudes, and attendance or persistence in school (E.1). Specific activities include provision of tutors or classroom aides, counseling and home visits, and instruction in Indian history, culture, and crafts. About one-fifth of the projects also provide small amounts of financial assistance to students so they may fully participate in project or school activities.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Program Effectiveness: The following summary is based on findings presented in the recently completed Impact Study (E.1).

Based on locally administered achievement tests, Indian student scores have risen significantly from 1972 to 1982 and are now only slightly below the average scores of non-Indian students in Part A districts. While there is no conclusive evidence that these gains are directly attributable to project services, local project staff and parent committee members generally rate these services as having had a positive impact.

Average attendance for Indian students in Part A districts indicates that they may already be at the national norm for all public school students--about 161 days per year. Nevertheless, improving attendance is a primary objective in 60 percent of the local projects studied. Substantial amounts of time are devoted to efforts to improve attendance and to reduce the high dropout rate among Indian students.

Ask for attitudes toward school and self, comparisons between Indian students who participated in Part A activities during the 1981-82 school year and other Indian students who did not participate provide some direct evidence of positive impacts. The differences observed are relatively small. One interpretation is that pre-existing differences in attitude may be a factor in determining participation in project activities.

Parental Involvement: Parent committees are organized and function in the areas emphasized by Part A legislation and regulation. Project directors report them to be the most heavily involved group (compared to project staff, Indian students, school staff, tribal leaders, and other parents) in determining Indian student needs. Forty-five percent of the project directors report the committees made recommendations (which are adopted about half the time). Parents and school personnel are generally supportive of the programs. About half of the tribal leaders, however, have negative comments about the projects, the staff, or what is taught.

LEA Impacts: Part A projects have had modest impacts on classroom level curricula and teaching practices, according to school administrators. Principals of 82 percent of survey schools report improvement in overall school curriculum due to Part A projects, and principals in 58 percent of these schools indicate project materials are used by some teachers in their schools.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

During 1984, all aspects of the program were reviewed to assist the Department in determining the need for legislative change and future budget levels. 2/

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. The Evaluation of the Impact of the Part A Entitlement Program Funded Under Title IV, the Indian Education Act, Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, Virginia, July 1983.

2. IEP Project Audit Report for FY 1983.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

A study of Indian-controlled schools will begin in Fiscal Year 1985.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Hakim Khan, (202) 245-8020

Program studies: Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8364

### Notes

1. Authorization figures are based on a formula which weights Indian student counts by average per-pupil expenditures in the State. Actual grants are rateably reduced in proportion to the amount of the appropriation.

2. Indian Education: Justification of Appropriation Estimates for Committees on Appropriations, Fiscal Year 1984.

# SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR INDIAN STUDENTS--PART B
(CFDA Nos. 84.061 and 84.087)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Indian Education Act, Section 1005(a)(1) and (b), P.L. 92-318, Title IV, Part B as amended, (20 U.S.C. 3385). (Expired September 30, 1984.)*

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $37,000,000 | $15,600,000 |
| 1981 | 37,000,000 | 14,500,000 |
| 1982 | 37,000,000 | 14,880,000 |
| 1983 | 37,000,000 | 12,600,000 |
| 1984 | 37,000,000 | 12,000,000 |

Purpose: Part B authorizes a variety of discretionary programs designed to improve the quality of educational programs for Indians. Specific activities authorized under Part B include:

Planning, pilot, and demonstration projects to plan for, test, and demonstrate the effectiveness of educational approaches for Indian students at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels. All FY 1984 grantees were Indian tribes, organizations, or institutions.

Educational service projects to serve Indian preschool, elementary, and secondary school students if other educational programs or services are not available to them in sufficient quantity or quality. All grantees are Indian tribes, organizations, and institutions.

Educational personnel development projects to train Indians for careers in education. There are two programs: Section 1005(d), making awards primarily to universities, and Section 422, making awards primarily to Indian tribes and organizations.

Fellowships for Indian students in the fields of medicine, law, education, business administration, engineering, and natural resources. Awards are based on financial need, academic record, other potential for success, and likelihood of service to Indians upon graduation. Priority is given to graduate students.

Resource and Evaluation Centers to provide technical assistance and disseminate information to Indian education projects and applicants. The Centers conduct workshops, make site visits, and prepare and distribute printed materials.

---

* The Indian Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511, authorized Indian Education through October 1, 1989.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were to:

- Restructure the regulations to allow for separate planning, pilot, and demonstration efforts.
- Process a final set of continuation grants.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1984, a separate competition was held using separate sets of criteria for a planning grant, a pilot grant, and a demonstration grant, awarding 6, 8, and 4 grants, respectively. In FY 1984, continuation awards were made to 49 Indian tribes and organizations and 7 universities to serve approximately 9,911 children and 656 trainees.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Scope:

The $12,000,000 appropriated for Part B programs in FY 1984 has affected over 10,000 students and educational personnel. Approximately 227 fellowships were awarded in FY 1984.

Five resource and evaluation centers funded in 1982 provide technical assistance to all projects funded under Title IV. Centers conduct workshops with project staff and parent groups in their region to improve project management, including needs assessment and evaluation activities. Of particular importance is the dissemination of information about promising practices in programs serving Indian children.

Effectiveness: No information is available

### D., E., F.

No new information.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No new studie are planned or under way.

### Contact for Further Information

Program Operations: Hakim Khan, (202) 732-1887
Program Studies: Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8364

## SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR INDIAN ADULTS--PART C
(CFDA No. 84.062)

### I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Indian Education Act, Section 316(a)(1)(2), P.L. 92-318, Title IV, Part C, as amended, (20 U.S.C. 1211a). (Expired September 30, 1984)*

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $8,000,000 | $5,830,000 |
| 1981 | 8,000,000 | 5,430,000 |
| 1982 | 8,000,000 | 5,213,000 |
| 1983 | 8,000,000 | 5,531,000 1/ |
| 1984 | 8,000,000 | 3,000,000 |

Purpose: Part C authorizes a range of activities designed to improve educational opportunities below the college level for Indian adults. Program objectives include: increasing literacy; improving basic skills; and increasing the number of Indian adults who pass the high school equivalency examination. Specific activities authorized by Part C include:

Educational services projects to provide educational opportunities for Indian adults. Projects focus on adult basic education to develop literacy and basic skills and on secondary education, including preparation for the high school equivalency examination. Many projects also offer consumer education and special services needed by adult students, such as academic and career counseling, aptitude and vocational testing, and job referral.

Planning, pilot, and demonstration projects to test and demonstrate innovative approaches to adult education specifically designed for Indian adults.

Grants are made primarily to Indian organizations and tribes. Funds appropriated and awarded in one fiscal year are generally used for activities during the next fiscal year. Projects are approved for a period of one year.

---

* The Indian Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511, authorizes Indian Education through October 1, 1989.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objective with respect to this program was to emphasize the educational service projects, since they are more directly aimed at serving the needs of Indian adults, while at the same time reserving a smaller amount of funds for experimental purposes and for designing programs that might be particularly effective in the education of Indian adults.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

Fiscal Year 1984 was the final year for continuation projects. In FY 1984, $4,937,000 supported 47 projects for more than 4350 Indian adults.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

No new information.

### D., E., F.

No new information.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

A descriptive and impact evaluation study on Part C is in progress; in part, the study will determine the extent to which the program provides services that cannot be obtained through Adult Education Programs.

### Contact for Further Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Program Operations: | Hakim Khan, (202) 732-1887 |
| Program Studies: | Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8364 |

### Note

1. Includes supplemental 1983 appropriation of $1,938,000 available until expended.

# ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROGRAM
(No CFDA Number)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Since 1982: "Secretary's Discretionary Program" (Subchapter D of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981), P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 3851). (Expires September 30, 1987). Prior to 1982: the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act, P.L. 91-257.

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $14,000,000 | $3,000,000 |
| 1981 | 18,000,000 | 2,850,000 |
| 1982 | 3,000,000 | 2,850,000 |
| 1983 | 1/ | 2,850,000 |
| 1984 | 1/ | 2,850,000 |

Purpose: To help schools and communities became aware of the complexity of the alcohol and drug-abuse problem and develop strategies to attack its causes rather than merely its symptoms. The program strongly encourages a coordinated school-community effort in preventive education, with an emphasis on reducing the socially disruptive behaviors often associated with abuse.

Method of Operation: Contracts are awarded to five Regional Training and Resource Centers. These centers award subcontracts to public school districts and private schools for training school teams in devising and applying methods of dealing with each team's unique alcohol and drug abuse problems. The ultimate beneficiaries of this training are students in grades 7-12; the training is provided at the regional centers. The remaining program funds support a contractor that provides a national data base and program support and collects evaluation data from subcontractors.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives: The Department's principal objectives for FY 1984 were to:

- Process contract documents to provide for training teams of school administrators, teachers, counselors, parents, students, law enforcement officials and other public service and community leaders to prevent or reduce destructive behavior associated with alcohol and drug abuse.
- Run new competition for the Regional Centers.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a) (Continued)

### B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- In FY 1984, 131 school teams were trained and 500 schools received technical assistance as did all 50 State education agencies.
- ED awarded 6 contracts: five for the Regional Centers and one for the National Data Base and Program Support Project.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program has established teams of school and community personnel supported with training and follow-up assistance in every State and territory. Now in its 12th year, the program has trained 4,500 teams throughout the country.

There are no evaluation data on students' alcohol and drug use behavior before and after the application of various program intentions.

The school-team approach has been recognized as successful in coordinating efforts by parents, students, educators, and the community to deal more effectively with alcohol and drug abuse prevention; the Department's efforts have been endorsed by inclusion in the President's Federal Strategy for Prevention of Drug Abuse and Drug Trafficking in FY 1982.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

There is to be more emphasis on parent involvement in the program.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

A study was completed by OPBE, "An Impact Study of Personnel Trained by the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program," A. T. Kearney, Inc., Alexandria, Virginia, May 1981.

A report on the "School Team Approach" was prepared under Grant No. 78-JN-AX-0016 from the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, "Reducing School Crime--A Report on the School Team Approach," Social Action Research Center, San Rafael, California, August 1983.

### F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program is requiring all subcontractors to design and implement their own evaluation and provide the evaluation data to the National Data Base and Program Support project.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program Operations: Myles Doherty, (202) 472-7960
Program Studies: Edward Rattner, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. This program is one of several activities authorized by ECIA, Chapter 2, Subchapter D (the Secretary's Discretionary Fund). The maximum amount authorized for Subchapter D is 6 percent of the total amount appropriated for Chapter 2. Subchapter D also establishes a minimum level for the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program of $2,850,000.

# WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL EQUITY
(CFDA No. 84.083)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Women's Educational Equity Act of 1978, Title IX, Part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, the Education Amendments of 1978, P.L. 95-561, (20 U.S.C. 3341-3348). (Expires September 30, 1989.)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $80,000,000 | $10,000,000 |
| 1981 | 80,000,000 | 8,125,000 |
| 1982 | 6,000,000 | 5,760,000 |
| 1983 | 6,000,000 | 5,760,000 |
| 1984 | 6,000,000 | 5,760,000 |

Purpose: To promote educational equity for women in the United States and to provide Federal funds to help education agencies and institutions meet the requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

Program Strategies: The legislation authorizes two strategies through a program of contracts and grants. First is a program to demonstrate, develop, and disseminate activities of national or State significance. The Department tries to avoid supporting previously funded ideas and to ensure geographic diversity. Second is assistance to projects of local significance including support for the operation of programs of equal educational opportunity. The legislation formerly stipulated that the Department could provide assistance to projects of local significance only when appropriations for the program exceed $15 million; hence, the provision has never been implemented. Recent amendments to the legislation, however, have lowered this "trigger" to $6 million. Those amendments will apply to FY 1985 awards.

Eligibility: Public agencies, nonprofit private agencies, organizations, institutions (including student and community groups), and individuals are eligible to apply for funds.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

For Fiscal Year 1984, the Department's principal objectives were:

- To make grants according to the following distribution among regulatory program priorities:

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

| Program Priorities | 1984 Planned Distribution |
|---|---|
| 1. Model projects on Title IX compliance | 15% |
| 2. Model projects on educational equity for racial and ethnic minority women and girls | 20% |
| 3. Model projects on educational equity for disabled women and girls | 20% |
| 4. Model projects to influence leaders in educational policy and administration | 0% |
| 5. Model projects to eliminate persistent barriers to educational equity for women | 25% |
| 6. Other authorized activities | 20% |

- To produce and market approved model products and strategies through the WEEA Publishing Center, as authorized in Sec. 932(a)(1) of the Act.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Because FY 1984 WEEA funds were frozen by the U.S. District Court in United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago, FY 1985 funds have been used to support 61 projects in FY 1984. At such time as the District Court releases the FY 1984 funds, accounting adjustments will be made so that the 1985 WEEA awards can be made.

- WEEA's publishing center (The Education Development Center) filled 2,300 orders in FY 1984, down from 14,617 in FY 1983. The number of products available in FY 1984 was 301, up from 216 in 1983. On the average, seven of each were sold at an average cost of $10 each.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

No new information.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration requested no funding for this program for FY 1985 because it prefers to provide flexible resources for States and school districts to use on this or other programs meeting local needs. The Congress, however, has appropriated $6 million for the program in FY 1985. WEEA was reauthorized and amended by the Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511. The amendments will apply to FY 1985 awards.

E., and F.

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Rosemary Wilson, (202) 245-2465
Program Effectiveness: Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

# MIGRANT EDUCATION
# HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY PROGRAM (HEP) AND COLLEGE ASSISTANCE MIGRANT PROGRAM (CAMP)
(CFDA Nos. 84.141 and 84.149)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, P.L. 89-329 as amended, (20 USC 1070d-2d), (Expires September 30, 1985); and the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, Chapter 1, P.L. 97-35 as amended, (20 USC 2761), (Expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | (Both Programs) | HEP | CAMP |
| 1980 | $12,000,000 | $6,160,000 | $1,173,000 |
| 1981 | 9,600,000 | 6,095,000 | 1,208,000 |
| 1982 | 7,500,000 | 5,851,200 | 1,159,680 |
| 1983 | 7,500,000 | 6,300,000 | 1,200,000 |
| 1984 | 8,250,000 | 6,300,000 | 1,950,000 1/ |

Purpose: HEP and CAMP assist students who are engaged, or whose families are engaged, in migrant or other seasonal farmwork. HEP assists them to obtain the equivalent of a secondary school diploma and subsequently to gain employment or begin postsecondary education or training. CAMP assists such students enrolled in the first undergraduate year at an institution of higher education to pursue successfully a program of postsecondary education.

Types of Services Provided: HEP provides outreach, teaching, counseling and placement services in order to recruit and serve eligible migrant and seasonal farmworker dropouts who are beyond the age of compulsory school attendance. HEP participants may receive room and board and stipends for their personal expenses. Most are housed on a college or university campus and may use the cultural, recreational, health, and other campus facilities. CAMP provides services needed to help participants complete the first undergraduate year. These services include tutoring, social counseling and assistance in obtaining grants, loans, and workstudy funds to assist with the remaining three undergraduate school years. CAMP participants may receive tuition, room and board, and stipends for personal expenses.

Eligibility: Grants for both HEP and CAMP are made to institutions of higher education (IHEs) or other public or nonprofit private agencies (that cooperate with an IHE).

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During Fiscal Year 1984, the Department's principal objective for this program was:

- o To make grant awards for the 1984-85 school year.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o The Department awarded twenty HEP grants to IHEs and associated public or non-profit private agencies located in fourteen States and Puerto Rico; it awarded ten CAMP grants to IHEs and associated public or nonprofit private agencies in eight States (Arizona, California, Idaho, Maryland, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, and Washington)

### C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness

HEP Program Scope: The twenty 1984-85 HEP projects are serving approximately 2800 students. Project enrollments range between 24 and 225.

CAMP Program Scope: The total number of students served through the 1984-85 CAMP programs is 710 and the ten funded projects have enrollments ranging from 20 to 140.

HEP/CAMP Program Costs: For school year 1984-85, the total funding for twenty HEP projects (serving 2800 participants) was $6,299,164. The total funding for ten CAMP projects was $1,949,998. The average cost per participant was $2,250 for HEP and $2,746 for CAMP.

Program Benefits and Cost Effectiveness: No new information is available. Results from a study completed prior to Fiscal Year 1984 were discussed in the Annual Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1983.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

No new information.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analysis

1. Annual Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1983. Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, Washington, D.C., 1984.

### F. Other Supporting Data

No new information.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Louis J. McGuinness, (202) 245-2722

Program Studies: James J. English, (202) 245-9401

### Notes

1. In Fiscal Year 1984, Congress approved a $750,000 supplemental appropriation for CAMP.

# ARTS IN EDUCATION PROGRAM (no assigned CFDA number)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Section 583(b) of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35, (20 U.S.C. 3851). (Expires September 30, 1987)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 20,000,000 | $ 3,500,000 |
| 1981 | 20,000,000 | 3,150,000 |
| 1982 | 3,150,000 | 2,025,000 |
| 1983 | 1/ | 2,025,000 |
| 1984 | 1/ | 2,125,000 |

Purpose: To conduct demonstration programs regarding the involvement of handicapped people in all the arts; to foster greater awareness of the need for arts programs for the handicapped; to sponsor model programs in the performing arts for children and youth; and to support a national network of State arts and education committees.

Method of Operation: The program is conducted through noncompetitive grants to the National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped, and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. In FY 1984 the grant amounts awarded were $1,450,000 and $675,000 respectively.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

For FY 1984, the Department's principal objective was to award both grants in a timely manner.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

ED made both awards as scheduled but the amount of one was subsequently reduced. 2/

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: Program records (E.1) show that in FY 1983 the National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped, supported more than 250 Very Special Art Festivals across the country. In addition, it held 600 training sessions for teachers, artists, and parents about arts programs for the handicapped.

In FY 1983 the Kennedy Center's program supported, in part:

- the American College Theatre Festival;
- activities of 47 Alliance for Arts Education committees; and
- an "Imagination Celebration" Program for Children and Youth.

Population Served: Table 1 below summarizes the number of program participants in FY 1983 by activity area. (E.1)

TABLE 1

| FY 1983 Activity | Number and Type of Participants |
|---|---|
| Very Special Arts Festivals | 400,000 handicapped students |
| Training Programs | 290,000 teachers, artists, parents |
| American College Theatre Festival (regional and national competitions) | 12,000 college students |
| Alliance for Arts Education Programs | 146,000 students, teachers, and parents |
| Programs for Children and Youth | 460,000 students, parents, and teachers |

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Annual Performance Reports, Program Files, OESE.

## F. Other Supporting Data

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are planned.

## Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Kay Henry, (202) 472-7960

Program studies: Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401

## Notes

1. This program is one of several activities authorized by ECIA, Chapter 2, Subchapter D. The maximum amount authorized for Subchapter D is 6 percent of the amount appropriated for Chapter 2. Subchapter D also establishes a minimum level for the Arts in Education program of $2,025,000.

2. A portion of the appropriation, $100,000, was not allocated as of 9/30/84 to the National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped, as a result of the pending court case, United States of America v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago (No. 80C-5124). Note: $100,000 will be awarded using FY 1985 appropriation.

# INEXPENSIVE BOOK DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM (no assigned CFDA number)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Section 583(b) of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35, 20 U.S.C. 3851. (Expires September 30, 1987)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 10,000,000 | $ 6,500,000 |
| 1981 | 11,000,000 | 5,850,000 |
| 1982 | 1/ | 5,850,000 |
| 1983 | 1/ | 5,850,000 |
| 1984 | 1/ | 6,500,000 |

Purpose: To support the distribution of inexpensive books to students from preschool through high school age to help motivate them to learn to read.

Method of Operation: The program is administered through a sole source contract awarded to Reading is Fundamental, Inc. (RIF)

Authorized Activities: RIF allocates funds to local community associations which then distribute the books. Community support through volunteer activities by educators, parents, librarians, and business and civic leaders is a key element of the program. Local projects may receive support of up to 75 percent of the cost of book purchases and 100 percent of book costs for migrant children. RIF also works with 137 book publishers and 202 distributors to provide discounts on books.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

For FY 1984, the Department's principal objective was to award the contract to RIF, Inc., in a timely manner.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

ED awarded the contract to RIF, Inc. as scheduled but at a lower amount than planned. 2/

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

**Students Served:** In FY 1984 about 2.2 million children in 3,000 communities received books through the RIF program and the efforts of more than 100,000 volunteers. (E.1)

**Benefits Provided:** In FY 1984 about 7 million books were distributed. Since 1976, the program has distributed almost 58 million books. (E.1)

A 1980 study found that the program was enthusiastically supported by school personnel, parents, volunteers, and sponsoring community agencies. Respondents reported their beliefs that the program was the only source of books most participating children had in their homes, that it stimulated greater parental involvement in their children's reading, and that it had beneficial impacts on school-community and school-parent relations (E.2). Department staff judge the portrayal to still be fairly accurate.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Annual Reports of RIF, Inc., to the Department's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.
2. An Evaluation of the Right-to-Read Inexpensive Book Distribution Program, General Research Corporation, McLean, Virginia, October, 1980.

## F. Other Supporting Data

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No further studies related to this program are planned.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Kay Henry, (202) 472-7960

Program studies: Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401

Notes

1. This program is one of several activities authorized by ECIA Chapter 2, Subchapter D. The maximum amount authorized for Subchapter D is six percent of the total amount appropriated for Chapter 2. Subchapter D also establishes a minimum for the Inexpensive Book Distribution Program of $5,850,000.

2. A portion of the appropriation, $650,000, was not allocated as of 9/30/84 as a result of the pending court case, United States of America v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago (No. 80C-5124). Note: The $650,000 will be awarded using FY 1985 appropriation.

## SECRETARY'S DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM--DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
(CFDA Nos. 84.122, 84.073, and 84.123)

### I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, Section 583(a) as amended, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 3851). (Expires September 30, 1987)

Funding Since 1983:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1983 | 1/ | $28,765,000 |
| 1984 | 1/ | 28,765,000 |

Purpose: To gather and disseminate information on the effectiveness of programs to meet the needs of individuals served by the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) and to assess the needs of those individuals, to support research and demonstrations related to the purposes of the ECIA, to improve educational personnel training, and to assist State and local educators in their implementation of the ECIA.

Structure: The Secretary's Discretionary Program assisted programs in four categories: (1) those mandated by the authorizing statute (Arts in Education, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education, and Inexpensive Book Distribution2/), (2) that newly mandated by amendments under P.L. 98-312 (Law-Related Education3/), (3) those included in the budget request or House or Senate committee reports (National Diffusion Network4/, Educational Television and Technology4/, and Evaluation of the ECIA Chapter 2 Block Grant), and (4) discretionary programs and projects undertaken by the Department.

- Category (1): Programs mandated by the ECIA

  These programs are described individually in the Annual Evaluation Report: "Arts in Education" in chapter 117, "Inexpensive Book Distribution" in chapter 118, and "Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education" in chapter 114.

- Category (2): Program newly mandated by P.L. 98-312

  The purpose of Law-Related Education is to enable non-lawyers, including children, youth, and adults, to become better informed concerning the law, the legal process, the legal system, and the fundamental principles upon which these are based. The Secretary's Discretionary Program provided nearly $1 million for law-related education in Fiscal Year 1984.

- Category (3): Programs cited by House or Senate Committee reports in response to the Administration's budget request

  Under the National Diffusion Network (NDN), organizations that have developed products or practices certified by the Department's Joint

Dissemination Review Panel and have NDN grants disseminate information about those efforts and provide training to educational personnel at new sites throughout the Nation as "Developer Demonstrators." Agencies help local educators install the certified products or practices through support from "State Facilitator" grants. Both types of grants are awarded competitively and may last as long as four years depending upon performance and availability of funds. Contracts are also awarded competitively and for varying lengths of time for organizations to provide technical assistance to NDN grantees and to identify and assess promising practices. The Secretary's Discretionary Program provided $10 million for NDN in Fiscal Year 1984.

Under the Education Television and Technology Program, contracts and grants are awarded competitively to organizations to develop, refine, and distribute educational television programs and to develop projects and school-based demonstrations of educational technology. The Secretary's Discretionary Program provided $1,290,000 for educational television and technology in Fiscal Year 1984.

Under the effort to evaluate the Chapter 2 Block Grant, the Department supported two studies. These are described in Chapter 104 of this Report. The Secretary's Discretionary Program provided $489,000 for this evaluation activity in Fiscal Year 1984.

- Category (4): The Secretary's Special Initiatives

Special Initiatives in Fiscal Year 1984 included a grant competition to fund research, demonstrations, and planning projects in two priority areas: Teacher Incentives and Unsolicited Applications. The Secretary's Discretionary Program spent approximately $4.5 million on these projects in Fiscal Year 1984: $1 million for Teacher Incentive projects and $3.5 million for Unsolicited Grants.

Table 1 on page 119-3 displays the intended funding flow for Fiscal Year 1984 for the Secretary's Discretionary Program. The Table shows the total amount and then the amounts for mandated programs, for programs cited by the Congress in response to Departmental requests, and for the Secretary's Special Initiatives.

Table 1. Secretary's Discretionary Program, Fiscal Year 1984 Intended Funding Flow: Total, Mandates, Responses to Departmental Requests, Secretary's Special Initiatives

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Intended Funding Flow | | |
| Total Appropriation: | | $28,765,000 |
| (1) Progams Mandated by the ECIA[2/]: | | $11,475,000 |
| Arts in Education | $2,125,000 | |
| Inexpensive Book Distribution | 6,500,000 | |
| Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education | 2,850,000 | |
| (2) Newly Mandated by P.L. 98-312[3/]: | | $ 1,000,000 |
| Law-Related Education | $1,000,000 | |
| (3) Congressional Responses to Departmental Budget Requests: | | $11,779,000 |
| Programs cited in House or Senate Committee reports: | | |
| National Diffusion Network[4/] | $10,000,000 | |
| Educational Television and Technology[4/] | 1,290,000 | |
| Evaluation of the Chapter 2 Block Grant | 489,000 | |
| (4) Discretionary Portion for Secretary's Special Initiatives: | | $4,511,000 |

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- Through the Secretary's Special Initiatives, to
  - stimulate the development of teacher incentive structures designed to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education by influencing teacher recruitment and personnel systems; and
  - stimulate research, development, demonstration, and related activities to focus on unmet national elementary and secondary education needs, particularly those identified by the National Commission on Excellence in Education.
- Through the National Diffusion Network, to
  - disseminate more information in the Secretary's priority areas, especially in technology applications, adult literacy, and teaching of math and science;

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

- increase number, quality, and geographic spread of adoptions of exemplary efforts; and

- provide technical assistance.

o Through the Education Television and Technology program, to

- continue to make available high-quality educational television programming, particularly for children;

- assist States and localities in making good use of new instructional technologies, notably microcomputers;

- complete development of, and make available through distribution arrangements with publishers, high-quality prototype software in reading, writing, and mathematics for upper elementary school students; and

- demonstrate in local school settings the effective use of technology to improve teaching and learning in reading, writing, science, and mathematics in elementary and secondary schools.

o Through the Law-Related Education program, to

- assist elementary and secondary schools in making educational activities about the legal system a permanent part of the curriculum; and

- provide high-quality instructional resources to be used in secondary school law-related education classes.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1984, the Secretary's Discretionary Program funds were frozen by the U.S. District Court in United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago. Some of the funds were released ($1.04 million) late in FY 1984 and were used to fund some National Diffusion Network projects and some Teacher Incentive Planning grants. The Discretionary Program's FY 1985 funds have been used to support the remainder of the 1984 projects. At such time as the District Court releases the frozen FY 1984 funds, accounting adjustments will be made so that the 1985 awards can be made.

In FY 1984, the progress and accomplishments of each of the program's components were:

Secretary's Special Initiatives:

o Fifty-one geographically dispersed applicants were selected to receive planning grants for developing a variety of teacher incentive structures to be implemented in their local school districts and to serve as models for others throughout the Nation. The grants totaled approximately $1 million.

B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

- o Forty unsolicited grants were awarded for projects of national significance to improve elementary and secondary education. These projects were designed to improve mathematics and science instruction, address recommendations of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, and advance teacher quality through incentives. In addition, other projects were supported to expand parental choice in education, increase literacy in the school-age population, improve teacher training, promote awareness of illiteracy, and develop programs to teach English as a second language.

National Diffusion Network:

- o The National Diffusion Network continued support of 51 Developer Demonstrator grants; funded 53 new State Facilitator grants and 40 new Developer Demonstrator grants in varied areas including the priority areas of technology, adult literacy, reading, science and math; assisted in the implementation of one new "technology lighthouse" in addition to the continuation of ten initially funded in previous years; identified 30 new promising practices in different geographic areas; and gave assistance to 60 programs for their submittals to the Joint Dissemination Review Panel.

Education Television and Technology:

- o Three new television series and the third season of the popular 3-2-1 CONTACT! program, all contributing to improved elementary and secondary science education, were aired on public television for the first time. Another activity was the multi-media, interdisciplinary program The Voyage of the MIMI. It combined television, print, and software materials with the objective of increasing children's understanding of science, mathematics, and technology. Marketed by Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, The Voyage of the MIMI is also coming to the attention of educators through a teacher-training program supported by the National Science Foundation. Also completed were four new television series targeted at the teen-age audience. Two in the first category (3-2-1 CONTACT! and POWERHOUSE) received a special Action for Children's Television award and a Gabriel Award, respectively; two in the last category (SOMEBODY ELSE'S PLACE and MOVING RIGHT ALONG) received the Gold Award at the New York International Film Festival and the Ohio State Award for excellent film-making, respectively.

- o Three major software development projects were completed and their products, designed to improve instruction in writing, reading, and mathematics in upper elementary and secondary classrooms through the application of microcomputers, are currently being made available to schools by D.C. Heath, WICAT, Inc., and Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.

B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

Law-Related Education:

- In FY 1984, $1 million supported 12 Law-Related Education projects. These included one project that worked with 18 States, 10 elementary and secondary school projects, and one special film project.

- Priority was given to projects that would support the institutionalization of model programs in elementary and secondary school classrooms. Project activities included: teacher training, curriculum development, dissemination of materials, seminars, mock trials, demonstration centers, alternative programs to help solve juvenile behavior problems, and a broad spectrum of related skill development activities for grades K-12.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

- Under the Secretary's Special Initiatives, awards ranged from about $6,000 to $370,000. The projects began during school year 1983-84, so no data on their effectiveness are available yet.

- Under the National Diffusion Network, costs are roughly $545 per school or about $5.75 per student served. The effectiveness of the effort can be assessed in terms of the number and geographic spread of sites adopting exemplary projects, educators' satisfaction with the programs distributed, the degree to which exemplary practices are faithfully implemented in the adopting sites, and the gains in student performance. Data on each are presented below:

  - Geographic Spread of Exemplary Projects: Based on figures compiled from FY 1984 project applications (see E.1 below), program staff report that 18,400 schools were adopting and implementing exemplary projects. More than 64,000 educators received training to use programs and practices, and approximately 1.7 million students, or 4 percent of fall 1982 elementary/secondary enrollment, were being served by programs adopted in these new sites.

  - Fidelity of Project Implementation: An earlier evaluation (E.5) reported that projects implemented via the NDN were reasonably faithful to developer specifications. Similarly, results from more recent studies (E.2 and E.3) have shown that NDN project adopters were implementing the new practices with considerable fidelity.

  - User Satisfaction: Results from studies conducted over the last six years (E.2, E.3, E.4, E.5, and E.6) indicate that users continued to report satisfaction with the training-related services and materials provided by the NDN.

  - Student Performance Gains: The most recent study (E.2) indicates that grantees and teachers in schools implementing NDN projects reported improved levels of student achievement and better student attitudes toward learning.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

- Under the Education Television and Technology Program, the 12 school-based technology demonstration programs were funded with $1.6 million in FY 1983. Although still in the first year of development, they were already receiving considerable publicity, requests for information, and site visitors. They were also attracting funds from other sources to enhance their own development and dissemination efforts, and were systematically collecting data on the impact of their technology applications on student achievement.

- Under the Law-Related Education Program, 12 grants were made averaging about $83,300 each.

A three-year research study on the impact of Law-Related Education on students was completed in 1984. It was the second national study of the effectiveness of the Law-Related Education Program. The findings, published in 1984, confirmed previous findings that law-related education, when taught according to specific, identifiable standards, can serve as a significant deterrent to delinquent behavior.

The evaluation found that students who are exposed to law-related education programs are less likely than others the same age to engage in eight of the 10 categories of delinquent behavior examined. Among law-related education students, rates dropped for offenses ranging from truancy and cheating on tests to smoking marijuana and acts usually classified as felonies. These students also showed improvement in many factors associated with law-abiding behavior, including favorable attitudes toward school and the police and avoidance of delinquent friends (E.7).

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

In order to award grants early enough for planning and implementation of demonstrations during school year 1984-85, notices about grant competitions supported by the Secretary's Discretionary Program will be published earlier in the year.

New NDN program regulations require educational programs to be reviewed by ED's Joint Dissemination Review Panel for evidence of effectiveness every four years.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. National Diffusion Network analyses of grantee applications.

2. Crandall, David P. and Associates, People, Policies, and Practices: Examining the Chain of School Improvement, Volumes I-X. Andover, MA: The Network, Inc., 1983.

3. Crandall, D.P., C.L. Thompson, and J.A. Taylor, The National Diffusion Network: A Special Report. Andover, MA: The NETWORK, Inc., November 1980.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above (Continued)

4. Campeau, P.L. et al., Final Report: Evaluation of Project Information Package Dissemination and Implementation: Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, January, 1979.

5. Emerick, J.A., Evaluation of the National Diffusion Network, Volumes 1 and 2, Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1977.

6. Stearns, M.S., Evaluation of the Field Test of Project Information Packages: Volume I-Summary Report. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1977.

7. Law-Related Education Evaluation Project Final Report, Phase II, Year 3. Boulder, COL: Social Science Education Consortium and Center for Action Research, June 1984.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies about programs supported by the Secretary's Discretionary Program are in progress.

### Contact for Further Information

Program Operations:

National Diffusion Network: Lee Wickline, (202) 653-7000
Educational Television and Technology: Jean Narayanan, (202) 254-5856
Law-Related Education: Rita Ray, (202) 472-7960
Discretionary Grant Competitions: Tom Enderlein, (202) 472-1762

Program Studies: Ann Weinheimer, (202) 245-8877

### Notes

1. Section 563 of ECIA authorized up to six percent of the funds appropriated for Chapter 2 of the ECIA to be used for the Secretary's Discretionary Program.

2. Each of the three programs mandated by law in the Secretary's Discretionary Program is covered by a separate chapter in the Annual Evaluation Report.

3. During FY 1984, the Law-Related Education Program was mandated by P.L. 98-312. It is included in this chapter because it became a newly mandated program at the end of the fiscal year. Next year, it will appear in a separate chapter in the Annual Evaluation Report.

4. Although the Secretary's Discretionary Program appears in the Annual Evaluation Report under Elementary and Secondary Programs, both the NDN and the Education Television and Technology program are administered by the Department's Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

# OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND MINORITY LANGUAGES AFFAIRS

# BILINGUAL EDUCATION--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES, STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES, INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, AND NONPROFIT PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

(CFDA No. 84.003)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 89-10, as amended by P.L. 95-561, Title VII of ESEA of 1965, (20 U.S.C. 3221-3261). (P.L. 97-35, Omnibus Budget Reconcilation Act of 1981, expired September 30, 1984.)1/

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980.................. | $ 299,000,000 | $ 171,763,000 |
| 1981.................. | 446,000,000 2/ | 161,427,000 |
| 1982.................. | 139,970,000 3/ | 138,058,000 |
| 1983.................. | 139,970,000 3/ | 138,057,000 |
| 1984.................. | 139,970,000 4/ | 135,679,000 |

Purpose: To develop and carry out programs of bilingual education in elementary and secondary schools, including activities at the preschool level, which are designed to meet the educational needs of children of limited English proficiency (LEP); to demonstrate effective ways of providing such children with instruction designed to enable them, while using their native language, to achieve competence in English; and to build the capacity of grantees to continue programs of bilingual education after Federal funding ceases.

Program Components: The Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs administers the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Program and funds 12 subprograms. Basic Projects in Bilingual Education, Demonstration Projects, and Desegregation Support Projects will be discussed in this chapter; the remaining nine programs are discussed in other chapters. A description of the three programs follows:

1. Basic Projects in Bilingual Education. A Basic Project grant is awarded to establish, operate or improve programs of bilingual education to assist children of limited English proficiency as defined in the legislation to improve their English-language skills. Programs supported by the Bilingual Education Act are intended to assist children to be able to enter an all-English-language educational program as soon as possible. LEAs are required to design programs within a framework that requires the use of English, and to the extent necessary, the child's home language in instruction in non-language subject areas. The projects are intended to build the capacity of the grantee to maintain programs of bilingual education when Federal funding is reduced or no longer available.

Program Components (Continued)

2. Demonstration Projects. This program provides financial assistance to demonstrate exemplary approaches to providing programs of bilingual education and to build the capacity of the grantee to maintain those programs when Federal funding is reduced or no longer available. In addition to demonstrating exemplary practices, these projects must meet the requirements that apply to the Basic Projects Program.

3. Desegregation Support Program. As discussed in the 1983 AER, the program was targeted for phase-out through budget policy. The phase-out was accomplished in FY 1984. Congress did not authorize funds for the Desegregation Support Program in FY 1984.

Eligibility: Local education agencies, institutions of higher education applying jointly with one or more local education agencies, or an elementary or secondary school operated or funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or a non-profit organization or Indian tribe are eligible for the Basic Grant and Demonstration program.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives:

For FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives for these programs were:

- To use the Basic Project Programs supplementary funds for programs that included a curriculum development component.
- Through the Demonstration Projects Program, to serve the following populations: high school students entering the job market and juvenile delinquents. The Demonstration Projects Program also had funding priorities for new projects that demonstrated exemplary approaches to the following components of a program of bilingual education: community or parental involvement, and instructional technology.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- In FY 1984 approximately 40 programs have a component of materials development for a total of $578,864. The monies were used to develop curriculum materials mostly for languages that do not have commercially available materials, especially for the Asian-American and Native-American languages.
- The Demonstration Projects Program funded 49 projects addressing its priorities.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Costs: In FY 1984, $89,565,408 was awarded through grants to [illegible] school districts for Basic and Demonstration Projects. For the [illegible]3-84 school year, Title VII basic projects spent approximately $389 [illegible] enrolled limited-English-proficient (LEP) student. This amount is based on the total funds awarded to local districts divided by the number of LEP students served.

Students Served. In FY 1984, 564 Basic grants were awarded to districts to serve about 229,980 LEP and 45,739 non-LEP students speaking more than 90 different languages. Under the Demonstration Projects program, 49 projects in 23 States were funded to serve about 16,349 students speaking 20 different languages. Thirty percent of the projects served fewer than 200 students, 34 percent enrolled from 200-399 students, and 36 percent served 400 or more students.

Student Coverage: Considerations of whether the program serves all eligible children depends on how many children need bilingual education. Programs funded by State and local education agencies must also be counted. For the 1983-84 school year, Title VII reported serving 159,900 children in 564 Basic Projects and 15,850 students in 49 Demonstration Projects. Additional federally funded bilingual education and English as a second language (ESL) services were provided under Title I, ESEA. Services were also provided by the Refugee Assistance Act to 93,920 children (see Chapter 203) and the ECIA Chapter 1 Migrant program (see Chapter 102, language services unknown).

In 1983, 22 States and American Samoa had legislation that either mandated bilingual education for LEP students or services for instructing LEP persons. In 1983, State expenditures for instructional services to LEP students were approximately $223 million. States provided special language instructional services to an estimated 925,000 LEP students in 1983 (E1).

Eligibility for Title VII Assistance. According to the Act, limited English proficient students are eligible for Title VII assistance. Title VII, ESEA defines "limited English proficiency" to mean an individual who was not born in the United States or whose native language is other than English; who comes from a home environment in which a language other than English is most relied upon for communication; or who is an American Indian or Alaskan native and comes from an environment in which a language other than English has had a significant impact on his or her level of English language proficiency and who, "by reason thereof" has sufficient difficulty in understanding, speaking, reading, and writing the English language to deny the individual the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English. Local districts in which such students are enrolled are eligible to apply for Title VII assistance. Title VII grants are awarded on a discretionary basis.

Identifying such children has turned out to be difficult. The English Language Proficiency Survey of 1982 is the Department's most current population survey of children with limited English proficiency. Preliminary results indicate that the number of children aged 5-14 who come from a non-English language background and are therefore language minority

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness - Grants to School Districts (Continued)

children is estimated at 4.5 million. Of these children, 2.4 million are limited English proficient (LEP)(E1). However, previous studies have shown that many of these children use English as their only or usual language. Based on these studies, the number of children who require English language services because of their inability to function in English is estimated to be substantially less than this 2.4 million LEP population estimate (E2).

Language Use. In a NIE study researchers documented the extent to which English is used by teachers in bilingual education classrooms over two school years. There was a marked increase in the use of English in the second year. One possible explanation for this change toward increased use of English in bilingual classrooms is that it reflects the public discussion of the function of bilingual education resulting from the Department's efforts to provide the schools with more flexibility and choice of instructional method for LEP students (E3, E4).

Effectiveness: Several new studies are underway. (For a review of completed studies, see Annual Evaluation Report for FY 1983, p. 201-9.)

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

In addition to emphasizing strongly the development of school districts' capacity to serve limited English proficient children, the Administration's legislative proposal, the Bilingual Education Improvements Act of 1983, was designed to restructure the basic grants to school districts program, revising program goals and criteria and ending long-term aid to districts. Funding priority would be given to districts serving children with the greatest immediate need: those whose usual language is not English.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation, 1984. U.S. Department of Education.

2. Baker, Keith. "Ideological Bias in Bilingual Education." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 27, 1984.

3. Fisher, Charles W. and Guthrie, Larry F. "Executive Summary: The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study," San Francisco: FarWest Laboratories, 1983.

4. Tikunoff, William. The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study: Utility of the SBIF Features for the Instruction of LEP Students." San Francisco: FarWest Laboratories, 1983.

### F. Other Supporting Data:

#### Supplementary Fact Sheet

| | 1984 |
|---|---|
| Basic Grants | $ 89,775,260 |
| Basic Grants to LEAs | $ 81,517,000 |
| Number of projects supported | 608 |
| Number of new projects | 189 |
| Number of LEP children served | 229,988 |
| Average per LEP pupil expenditure | $389 |
| Demonstration Grants to LEAs | $7,967,000 |
| Number of projects supported | 40 |
| Number of new projects | 14 |
| Number of children served | 16,349 |
| Average per pupil expenditure | $489 |
| Special Demonstration Contracts | $291,262 |
| Number of contracts | 1 |
| Total Projects | 648 |
| Number of children served | 246,985 |
| Desegregation Support Grants | $0 |
| Number of projects | 0 |

### III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

- Development Associates continued work on the Congressionally-mandated longitudinal evaluation study which will determine the impact of services to limited English proficient students.

- SRA Technology began a major evaluation which will study structured English immersion programs for LEP students in the United States as compared to more traditional bilingual education approaches.

- Other ongoing and new studies funded under Part C which are relevant to the Basic Grant program include:

  --Advanced Technology, Incorporated is examining local school districts which do not receive Title VII funding, but are able to build instructional capacity.

  --Naomi Gray Associates is examining services provided to junior and senior high school language minority/limited English proficient students.

  --Decision Resources, Incorporated is examining Census data to determine the number of limited English proficient students in the United States.

  --Hope Associates, Incorporated will study the needs and services to recent immigrant students.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b) (Continued)

--Pelavin Associates, Incorporated will examine entry and exit criteria for students in bilingual education programs.

--The National Center for Bilingual Research is validating the Language Measurement and Assessment Instrument, an instrument which evaluates language proficiency.

--MESA, Incorporated is studying Title VII programs which serve native American and Alaskan native LEP students.

--COMSIS is reviewing the state-of-the-art of education technologies implemented in programs of instruction serving LEP students in Basic and Demonstration projects.

--Human Resources Corporation is examining the needs of and services to Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders.

--The Educational Testing Service, Incorporated is supplementing the National Assessment of Educational Progress with questions for LEP students.

### Contacts for Further Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Program Operations: | Rudy Cordova, (202) 245-2609 (Basic Program)<br>Rudy Munis, (202) 245-2595 (Demonstration Program) |
| Program Studies: | Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401 |

### Notes

1. The Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511 (October 19, 1984), authorizes bilingual education through FY 1988.

2. Includes $90 million for bilingual vocational training (authorized under the Vocational Education Act) and $8 million for bilingual desegregation programs (authorized under the Emergency School Aid Act).

3. This authorization is established by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35. This authorization and appropriation is shared with programs in Chapters 201, 204, and 205.

4. Section 587(a) of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981, P.L. 97-35, repealed the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). However, Section 751 of Title VII was not affected.

# BILINGUAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES, HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS, AND PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS (CFDA Nos. 84.077, 84.099, and 84.100)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE:

Legislation: P.L. 94-482 as amended by P.L. 94-40 (20 U.S.C. 2301-2461). (Expired September 30, 1984.)1/

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980.............. | $ 80,000,000 | $ 4,800,000 |
| 1981.............. | 90,000,000 | 3,960,000 |
| 1982.............. | 735,000,000 2/ | 3,686,000 3/ |
| 1983.............. | 735,000,000 2/ | 3,686,000 3/ |
| 1984.............. | 735,000,000 2/ | 3,686,000 3/ |

Purpose: Bilingual vocational programs are authorized under the Vocational Education Act, as amended. These programs provide occupational training, and the chance to increase job-related English-language skills, to adults and out-of-school youth who have limited English-speaking ability. They also support the training of bilingual vocational instructors and the development of instructional materials.

Eligible Recipients: Applicants eligible for bilingual vocational training grants and contracts include: local education agencies, appropriate State agencies, postsecondary education institutions, private nonprofit vocational training institutions, nonprofit educational or training organizations especially created to serve a group whose language as normally used is other than English, and private for-profit agencies and organizations.

For bilingual vocational instructor training grants (CFDA No. 84.099), the following agencies or institutions are eligible for grants or contracts: (a) State agencies and (b) public and private nonprofit educational institutions. Private for-profit educational institutions are eligible only for contracts.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives: No special goals or objectives were identified for this program in FY 1984.

B. Progress and Accomplishments: No new information

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Students Served. In FY 1984, 24 student training projects under bilingual vocational training (84.077), totaling $4,784,241, 4/ recruited and trained 2,991 persons of limited English-speaking ability. Since the inception of the program, 161 projects and 14,822 trainees have been funded.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Types of Benefits Provided: Under the Bilingual Vocational Training Program, individuals with limited English-speaking ability are trained for gainful employment as semi-skilled or skilled workers in environments where English is the language normally used. Under the Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program, participants receive training in vocational skills, in the methodology of bilingual education, and in job-placement techniques as well as job-related English-as-a-second-language (ESL) instruction or related course work.

Program Effectiveness: No current information is available.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

It is proposed that training be provided for ESL and vocational instructors at the local education agency level, in the use of computerized language analysis of vocational instructional materials for the purpose of preparing job-related ESL curricula.

There is also a need to provide training for the staffs of State education agencies and of institutions of higher education in the development of bilingual vocational instructor training programs.

E., and F.

No new information.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

Juarez and Associates of Los Angeles, California, is preparing a report identifying successful strategies used in the six currently funded bilingual vocational instructor training projects.

Contacts for Further Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Program Operations: | James F. Rogers, (202) 447-9227<br>Velma Robinson--BVT, (202) 732-1752<br>Barbara Wells--BVIT, (202) 732-1840 |
| Program Studies : | Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401 |

Notes

1. The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, P.L. 98-524 (October 19, 1984), authorizes bilingual vocational education through FY 1989.

2. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 establishes an authorization for this program under the Vocational Education Act of $735 million, with no specific authorization for bilingual vocational training.

Notes (Continued)

3. Section 183 of the Vocational Education Act, as amended, specifies that available funds are to be divided among the three different programs as follows:

   o Sixty-five percent for the activities supported under the Bilingual Vocational Training Program (84.077).

   o Twenty-five percent for the activities supported under the Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program (84.099).

   o Ten percent for the activities supported under the Bilingual Vocational Instructional Materials, Methods, and Techniques (84.100).

4. In order to put the program on the same funding schedule as other activities operated by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, the bulk of both FY 1983 and FY 1984 appropriations were obligated in 1984.

## TRANSITION PROGRAM FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN--FORMULA GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.146) 1/

### I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 96-212, Section 412 of the Refugee Act of 1980 (8 U.S.C. 1522); Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982, P.L. 97-363. (Expires September 30, 1985.)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation 2/ |
|---|---|---|
| 1980................ | Indefinite | $ 23,168,000 |
| 1981................ | Indefinite | 44,268,000 3/ |
| 1982................ | Indefinite | 0 |
| 1983................ | Indefinite | 16,600,000 |
| 1984................ | Indefinite | 16,600,000 |

Purpose: To provide Federal assistance to State and local educational agencies to meet the special education needs of eligible children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools. The grants may be used to develop capacity through funding special curriculum materials, bilingual teachers and aides, remedial classes, and guidance and counseling services required to bring these children into the mainstream of the American education system.

Eligibility: The program provides grants to State education agencies to assist local educational agencies in providing special services to eligible children. The State must have an approved plan for the administration of refugee resettlement programs on file with the Office of Refugee Resettlement in the Department of Health and Human Services.

Administration: The program is administered by the Department of Education via an interagency agreement with the Department of Health and Human Services.

### II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives:

Other than following the annual formula grant procedures, no new goals or objectives for FY 1984 were identified for this program.

B. Progress and Accomplishments: Not applicable.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Students Served: For school year 1984-85, $16,600,000 of FY 1984 funds were used for the education of refugee children; 93,920 children were served for an average of $159 per child. For the same school year, $5 million was appropriated under Section 501(a) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1982, as amended, for the education of Cuban and Haitian entrant children, and 12,959 children were served for an average cost of $386 per child.

The Secretary determines the amounts of the awards to State educational agencies (SEA) based on a count of the eligible children enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in the States. For each year in which funds are made available for this program, the Secretary announces a count date when SEA's must count the children eligible for assistance. Some State and local agencies may have difficulty in arriving at accurate counts because identification of children eligible for assistance involves privacy issues which in some cases are governed by State and local law.

Geographic Distribution: For school year 1984-85, the States reported that there were 93,920 eligible refugee children enrolled in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. The nine States with refugee children enrollment of 3,000 or more have a total of 63,800 refugee children or 68 percent of the total refugee children enrollment. California alone accounted for 31 percent of the total.

Enrollment Decrease: Between school year 1983 and 1984, total enrollment of refugee children decreased by approximately 15 percent.

Instructional Methods: Bilingual education was used in 17 States (required by State law in four States). In addition, 13 States used ESL, 13 States used ESL and bilingual programs, and 10 States operated tutorial programs. Finally, 31 States operated summer programs.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

## D., E., and F.

No new information.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

Not applicable.

## Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Jonathan Chang, (202) 732-1842
Program Studies : Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401

Notes

1. During fiscal years 1980 through 1984, Congress also made special appropriations to meet the special educational needs of the Cuban and Haitian entrant children. The Secretary of Education requested and received a FY 1980 appropriation of $7.7 million under Section 303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended. Fiscal year funding for Cuban and Haitian entrants for 1981 ($6 million), 1982 ($5.7 million), 1983 ($5 million) and 1984 ($5 million) was made available under Section 501(a) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, as amended. Appropriation language limited eligibility for FY 1981, 1982, 1983 and 1984 funds to those school districts with at least 10,000 entrants enrolled in the districts' schools. Only Dade County, Florida, qualifies.

2. Appropriations under this authority were made to the Department of Health and Human Services and were then transferred to the Department of Education. These appropriations do not include funds for Cuban and Haitian entrants made available under Section 501(a) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, as amended.

3. Appropriations made in FY 1981 were used for a two-year period.

# BILINGUAL EDUCATION TRAINING PROGRAMS--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS, STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES, INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION OR NONPROFIT PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

(CFDA No. 84.003)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 89-10, as amended by P.L. 95-561, Title VII of ESEA of 1965, (20 U.S.C. 3221-3261). (P.L. 97-35, Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 expired September 30, 1984.)1/

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 299,000,000 | $ 171,763,000 |
| 1981 | 446,000,000 2/ | 161,427,000 |
| 1982 | 139,970,000 3/ | 138,058,000 |
| 1983 | 139,970,000 3/ | 138,057,000 |
| 1984 | 139,970,000 3/ | 135,679,000 |

Purpose: Training Programs, School of Education Projects, and Fellowship Projects provide financial assistance to local education agencies, institutions of higher education, State education agencies and private nonprofit organizations to provide training and develop capacities to train individuals who are participating in, or are preparing to participate in, programs of bilingual education.

Program Components:

1. Training Projects. This program provides financial assistance to establish, operate, or improve programs to train bilingual education teachers and administrators, paraprofessionals, parents and other personnel participating or preparing to participate in bilingual education programs. Three types of projects are funded under this program:

- o Projects that provide undergraduate and graduate degree-oriented training, and develop and improve training programs at institutions of higher education.
- o Projects that provide non-degree training to improve the skills of parents and educational personnel participating in programs of bilingual education; and
- o Projects that provide training to State education agency personnel to improve their skills in carrying out their responsibilities with regard to programs of bilingual education.

2. Schools of Education Projects. This program provides financial assistance to institutions of higher education to develop or expand their capacity to provide degree-granting bilingual education training programs. Funds are used to pay salaries of instructors in bilingual education, with a declining Federal share of costs over the three-year grant.

Program Components (Continued)

3. Fellowship Program. This program provides fellowship assistance to full-time graduate students who already have a master's degree and who are preparing to become trainers of teachers of bilingual education. The statute and regulations require a recipient to work in authorized activities for a period of time equivalent to the time for which the student received assistance under the program or pay back the assistance received.

Eligibility:

1. Training Projects. Those eligible for assistance under this program are a local school district; a State education agency; an institution of higher education or a nonprofit private organization that applies after consultation with one or more local education agency or with a State education agency; or an institution of higher education or a private, nonprofit organization that applies jointly with one or more local education agency or with a State education agency.

2. Schools of Education Projects. Those eligible for assistance under this program are institutions of higher education with a school, department, or college of education or a bilingual education training program. Institutions must apply after consultation with one or more local school districts or with a State education agency or an institution of higher education with a school of education or a bilingual education training program that applies jointly with one or more local school districts or with a State education agency.

3. Fellowship Program. An institution of higher education that offers a program of study leading to a degree above the master's level in the field of training teachers for bilingual education is eligible to participate in this program. An individual is eligible to apply for a fellowship under this program if this individual: (1) is a citizen, a national or a permanent resident of the United States; (2) is in the United States for other than a temporary purpose and can provide evidence from the Immigration and Naturalization Service of his or her intent to become a permanent resident; or (3) is a permanent resident of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, or the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands; and (4) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student in a course of study offered by an institution of higher education approved for participation in this program. The course of study must lead to a degree above the master's level in the field of training teachers for bilingual education.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives: During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives with respect to the Training Projects Program were as follows:

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a) (Continued)

- To fund programs proposing to certify bilingual teachers in science, math, and educational technology.
- To fund short- or long-term institutes to improve the skills of parents and other participants in carrying out their responsibilities in programs of bilingual education.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- Approximately 15 percent of the grants funded projects to certify bilingual teachers in science, math, and educational technology during FY 1984.
- Twelve projects were funded to improve the skills of parents and others in carrying out their responsibilities in programs of bilingual education.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: FY 1984 awards totaled $14 million for 135 undergraduate and graduate training projects. An additional $2 million was awarded for 12 short-term training institutes. During FY 1984, 369 fellowships were awarded at 33 institutions of higher education, totaling $3.5 million.

Teacher Availability. The number of limited-English-proficient (LEP) students of school-age is one of the critical factors to consider in attempts to estimate the need for teachers of LEP children. Another factor is the type of LEP students who need to be served. Until the results of the 1980 Census and 1982 English Language Proficiency Survey have been analyzed, valid estimates cannot be made.

Program Effectiveness: No new information is available.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

The budget policy for 1984 continued efforts begun in 1983 to streamline and focus the bilingual education training programs. Reductions were made through (1) phasing out the Fellowship and Schools of Education programs, (2) reducing the short-term training institutes programs, and (3) removing State education agency training from the Training Projects Program and placing it in the SEA assistance program under Support Services.

The Schools of Education and the Fellowship programs have contributed successfully to increasing the number of doctoral students and graduates in bilingual education and have developed capacity in institutions of higher education in 26 States. Because of this capacity, the Department now believes that training resources should be targeted to inservice and bachelor degree-level training.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a) (Continued)

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

Not Applicable.

### F. Other Supporting Data:

### Supplementary Budget Sheet

| | 1984 Actual |
|---|---|
| Training Programs | $ 21,288,000 |
| Fellowship program | $ 3,496,709 |
| Number of fellows | 369 |
| Number of projects | 34 |
| Schools of Education projects | $ 365,707 |
| Number of projects | 10 |
| IHE graduate/undergraduate | $ 14,004,442 |
| Number of students | 5,600 |
| Number of programs | 136 |
| Short-term training institutes | $ 2,300,000 |
| Number of participants | 3,833 |
| Number of programs | 12 |
| SEA training projects | $ 300,000 |
| Number of projects | 5 |

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

Arawak Consulting Corporation is examining in-service training. The objectives of the study are to identify alternatives for inservice staff development and then to implement the alternatives to determine their relative effectiveness and management and cost demands.

### Contacts for Further Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Program Operation: | Edwin J. Neumann, (202) 245-2595<br>James F. Rogers, (202) 447-9227 |
| Program Studies: | Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401 |

### Notes

1. The Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511 (October 19, 1984), authorizes bilingual education through FY 1988.

2. Includes $90 million for bilingual vocational training and $81 million for bilingual desegregation programs.

3. This authorization is established by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35. This authorization and appropriation are shared with programs in Chapters 201, 204, and 205.

# BILINGUAL EDUCATION SUPPORT SERVICES--LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS, STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES, INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
(CFDA No. 84.003)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 89-10, as amended by P.L. 95-561, Title VII of ESEA of 1965, (20 U.S.C. 3221-3261). (P.L. 97-35, Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, expired September 30, 1984.)1/

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 299,000,000 | $ 171,763,000 |
| 1981 | 446,000,000 2/ | 161,427,000 |
| 1982 | 139,970,000 3/ | 138,058,000 |
| 1983 | 139,970,000 3/ | 138,057,000 |
| 1984 | 139,970,000 3/ | 135,679,000 |

Purpose: The Support Services Projects Program provides financial assistance to strengthen programs of bilingual education and bilingual education training programs.

Program Components: Support services activities include: State Education Agency Projects for Coordinating Technical Assistance; Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Centers, Materials Development Projects Program; Multifunctional Resource Centers; and the Research and Development Program.

1. State Education Agency Projects for Coordinating Technical Assistance provide Federal financial assistance to State education agencies for projects coordinate technical assistance provided by other agencies in support of bilingual education programs funded in their State.

2. Multifunctional Service Centers provide technical support services to schools with federally- and non-federally-funded programs designed for children with limited English proficiency.

3. Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Centers (EDACs) assist programs of bilingual education and bilingual education training programs within regional service areas in assessing, evaluating, and disseminating bilingual education materials.

4. Materials Development Projects Program awards grants and contracts to local education agencies or institutions of higher education that apply jointly with one or more local education agency to develop instructional and testing materials for use in programs of bilingual education and bilingual education training programs. No applications were solicited for this program in FY 1984.

Program Components (Continued)

5. Research and Development Program authorizes: (a) research, development, and evaluation activities to enhance the effectiveness of bilingual education and other programs for persons who have language proficiencies other than English; and (b) dissemination of information regarding teaching and learning, bilingualism, and limited-English-proficient (LEP) student achievement, which is useful for programs of bilingual education.

a. Research, Development and Evaluation is supported under Part C of Title VII. Since 1979, research and evaluation activities have focused on three areas--assessment of national needs for bilingual education, improvement of the effectiveness of services to students, and improvement in Title VII management and operation.

b. Dissemination of information related to bilingual education and services to children with limited English proficiency is the responsibility of the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Newsletters and publications are widely disseminated to existing projects, State education agencies, and government decision-makers.

Eligibility:

1. State Education Agency Projects for Coordinating Technical Assistance. Only State education agencies are eligible for assistance.

2. Multifunctional Service Centers. Those eligible include: (1) institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and community colleges and private nonprofit organizations) which apply, after consultation with, or jointly with, one or more local education agencies or a State education agency; (2) local education agencies; and (3) State education agencies.

3. Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Centers. Those eligible for assistance are a local educational agency or an institution of higher education that applies jointly with one or more local education agency.

4. Materials Development Projects Program. A local education agency or institution of higher education that applies jointly with one or more local education agency is eligible for assistance under the Materials Development Projects Program.

5. Research and Development Program. Awards under this program are made by grant and contract on a competitive basis. Eligible applicants include institutions of higher education, private and non-profit organizations, State education agencies, and individuals.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

Goals and objectives for the support services programs have not changed since FY 1983. For more information, refer to the Annual Evaluation Report for FY 1983.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Consolidation of services provided by Bilingual Education Service Centers (BESCs) and EDACs into 16 Multifunctional Support Service Centers.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

### 1. State Education Agency Technical Assistance Projects

Program Scope: The legislation limits State education agencies to an award amount of 5 percent or less of the total of Title VII Part A grants received by their districts the preceding fiscal year.

Forty-nine projects with a total expenditure of $3,930,631 were served by this program in FY 1984.

Benefits Provided. Examples of SEA coordination activities include--(1) coordination of assistance provided by other agencies to elementary and secondary schools within the State to improve the quality and adequacy of instruction and management of programs of bilingual education assisted under Title VII; and (2) coordination of the evaluation by other agencies of programs of bilingual education assisted under Title VII to determine their effectiveness.

Program Effectiveness: In FY 1984, the U.S. Department of Education contracted to conduct a study of SEA practices (E1). The objectives of the study were to: (a) describe and analyze SEA policies and activities, (b) describe and analyze the SEA-level management structure for the coordination of technical assistance, and (c) provide information on technical management and assistance activities which the Department may use in order to help SEA grantees assist local schools in building their capacity. The contract called for the development of case studies of the implementation of Title VII SEA grants in nine States.

The study reported several concerns expressed by SEA staff: (1) The SEA staff would like to have greater authority over funding decisions for local applications and a more substantive role in project monitoring activities; (2) The recent shift from BESCS, funded by grants, to Bilingual Education Multifunctional Service Centers (BEMSCS), funded by contracts, has caused many problems. The interviewees expressed concern over the fact that the BEMSCS can only provide services explicitly defined in their contracts. This lack of flexibility has reduced the usefulness

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

of BEMSCS as assistance providers, according to the SEA informants; (3) Fiscal support for SEAs is based on a percentage of the LEA grants in the State. This type of Title VII support clearly favors States that have large numbers of LEA grants. States with few LEA grants receive too little money to mount a comprehensive effort.

### 2. Multifunctional Service Centers

Program Scope: Sixteen centers were funded in FY 1984 with approximately nine million dollars. Fourteen were funded as regional centers and two to provide services to specific groups. The two national centers are expected to serve Asian and Arabic language populations.

Benefits Provided: Multifunctional Service Centers: (1) provide support services for building the capacity of districts to improve instructional programs and other support services designed specifically for limited-English proficient students in the service areas; (2) provide technical assistance to Title VII basic project grantees to improve project management, documentation, and evaluation; (3) coordinate with the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE),other support service centers, and other federally funded centers or projects, to develop and implement a strategy or process for exchanging information and planning to improve the delivery and quality of support services provided by centers; and (4) coordinate with State education agencies in their plans for providing technical assistance to ensure that the Centers' plans complement the SEAs' plans for assisting, with State or Federal funds, the Title VII projects operating in the States.

Program Effectiveness: No information.

### 3. Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Centers

Program Scope: There were three EDACs in FY 1984, funded at $1.7 million.

Benefits Provided: These centers evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of materials for use in programs of bilingual education or in bilingual education training programs; they publish and disseminate evaluation methods and materials; they assess the number of children in need of bilingual education, the number of and need for bilingual education teachers and personnel, and the need for curriculum materials and student assessment instruments; they develop instruments and procedures for use in needs assessment surveys; and they train State education agency personnel and others working with programs of bilingual education in the selection of appropriate evaluation and assessment methods and materials.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Program Effectiveness: The findings of a recent Department of Education study indicate that the EDACs, as presently constituted, have not achieved their major objectives. They currently carry out few activities in the area of needs assessment and, except for the Lesley College EDAC, little in the area of evaluation. Further, their publication and dissemination activities, while extensive, have failed to reach their intended clientele or to receive wide use in bilingual education programs (E2).

### 4. Materials Development Projects Program

Program Scope: The Deaprtment allocated $2.5 million for continuation grants for materials development in FY 1984.

Benefits Provided: Three major activities are authorized for materials development projects: (a) developing, testing, and disseminating instructional and testing materials for use in programs of bilingual education; (b) developing instructional materials for use by institutions of higher education in training persons who are participating in, or preparing to participate in, programs of bilingual education; and (c) conducting needs assessments to determine specific needs for materials development. No new projects were funded in FY 1984.

Program Effectiveness: No current information.

### 5. Research and Development Program

Program Scope: The Department awarded $5.1 million for research and evaluation studies and evaluations. Another $1.7 million was budgeted to the National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education.

Benefits Provided: Part C research results are beginning to provide information for policy and management. Since 1979, 60 studies have been supported, including basic research, applied research, development, and evaluation. A major focus of these documents is on research findings of studies funded by the Part C research funds. The Clearinghouse also provides specific information on request. A toll-free number expedites these requests.

Program Effectiveness: Results of one major Part C study, the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study (SBIF), were reported in FY 1984. The SBIF found that teachers in bilingual programs that had been judged by others to be outstanding programs exhibited the same kinds of classroom teaching behavior that characterize good teachers in regular classrooms. These teachers used English about 60 percent of the time. The teachers emphasized development of English language skills whenever instruction was in English, not just during "English class" (E3, E4). This is essen-

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

tially the "immersion method" of teaching English. The Department has underway a study to examine the effects of all-day immersion programs of instruction.

Studies indicated that average instructional time devoted to basic skills each day was 128 minutes. Students, on the average, paid close attention to this instruction 80 percent of the time, which is a higher rate of attention than is found in the typical American school (E3, E4).

The extent to which English was used by teachers was followed over two school years. There was a marked increase in the use of English in the second year. One possible explanation for this change is that it reflects the public discussion of the function of bilingual education that resulted from the Department's efforts to provide the schools with more flexibility and choice of instructional method for LEP students (E3, E4).

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education was evaluated and found to be well-managed in carrying out the tasks assigned to it by the Government. However, questions were raised about the scope of activities assigned to the Clearinghouse. There was a complete duplication of the ERIC data base on bilingual education. Annual expenditures on the Bilingual Clearinghouse are very high in relation to other clearinghouses because of: (1) the duplication of ERIC services, (2) the use of Clearinghouse funds to prepare and publish special reports and (3) the implementation of program activities that are generally not assigned to clearinghouses.

On five measures of standard clearinghouse activities, NCBE's operations are those of a medium-sized clearinghouse whose budget would fall in the range of $250,000-$570,000 annually. NCBE's $1,864,932 budget is largely spent on activities above and beyond those usually associated with a clearinghouse.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

No new information.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Nava, Hector. Study of Title VII Funded State Education Agency Activities and Service Delivery Systems. Mountain View, CA.: SRA Technology, 1984.

2. Rodiguez, Blanca Rosa et al. An Evaluation of the Bilingual Education Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Centers. Washington, D.C.: Pelavin Associates, 1984.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above: (Continued)

3. Fisher, Charles W. and Guthrie, Larry F. "Executive Summary: The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study." San Francisco: FarWest Laboratories, 1983.

4. Tikunoff, William. The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study, "Utility of the SBIF Features for the Instruction of LEP Students." San Francisco: FarWest Laboratories, 1983.

5. Reisner, Elizabeth. Assessment of the Operations and Effectiveness of the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Washington, D.C.: Pelavin Associates, 1984.

### F. Other Supporting Data:

#### Supplementary Budget Sheet

| | 1984 Actual |
|---|---|
| Support Services | $ 13,480,621 |
| SEA technical assistance | $ 3,930,621 |
| Number of projects | 49 |
| Studies and evaluations | $ 5,093,000 |
| Clearinghouse | $ 1,684,000 |
| Advisory council | $ 82,000 |
| Materials development and dissemination | $ 2,499,000 |
| Multifunctional Resource Centers | $ 8,900,000 |
| Number of projects | 16 |

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

In FY 1984, the Part C research program began the following activities:

- A review of the English-as-a-second language literature by InterAmerica Research Associates of Roslyn, Virginia.
- A Hispanic Supplement to the High School and Beyond Study, (Third Followup), by the National Opinion Research Corporation (NORC) of Chicago, Illinois.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b) (Continued)

- o A National Longitudinal Study, (Hispanic Supplement) by NORC.
- o Special Tasks for the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education by InterAmerica Research Associates.
- o Examining the Bilingual Education Management Information System--ADP, in-house.
- o A study of Services to Recent Immigrants by Hope Associates, Incorporated of Washington, D.C.
- o A Language Minority Student Supplement to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) conducted by the Education Testing Service (ETS) in Princeton, New Jersey.
- o A field Grant Study of LEP Students Transitioning into All-English Services by Network, Incorporated of Boston, Massachusetts.
- o A Synthesis of Part C and Other ED Research on Language Minority Populations Since FY 1979 by Pelavin Associates of Washington, D.C.
- o Teacher Language Skills Survey by InterAmerica Research Associates of Roslyn, Virginia
- o Language Assessment Instruments Used by Local Schools by East/West Associates of San Francisco, California
- o Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study by the Center for InterActive Research and Development of San Francisco, California
- o Student Data Bases Compiled by School Districts by the New York City Board of Education in Brooklyn, New York
- o Survey of School of Education Grants by Ebd Associates of Washington, D.C.
- o An Evaluation of the Service Structures of the Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Centers (EDAC) and the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education by Pelavin Associates of Washington, D.C.
- o A Longitudinal Impact Study--Outlying Territories Option--by Development Associates of Arlington, Virginia
- o An Assessment Phase (Phase II) to the Longitudinal Impact Study by Development Associates of Arlington, Virginia
- o An Assessment Phase to the Immersion Projects Study by SRA Technologies in Mountain View, California

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b) (Continued)

- Analyzing 'DISTAR' Project Study Achievement Data funded through an unsolicited proposal to ED by the Uvalde, Texas, Independent School District
- An LEA Selection Procedures Study by Pelavin Associates of Washington, D.C., that will examine entry/exit criteria for bilingual education programs
- A Special Analysis of Data from the "English Language Proficiency Study" (ELPS) on National LEP Persons Estimates by Decision Resources of Washington, D.C.

### Contacts for Further Information:

Program Operations: Rudy Munis, (202) 245-2695
Gilbert N. Garcia, (202) 245-2600
Program Studies: Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401

### Notes

1. The Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511 (October 19, 1984), authorized bilingual education through FY 1988.
2. Includes $9 million for bilingual vocational training and $81 million for bilingual desegregation programs.
3. This authorization was established by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35. The authorization and appropriation are shared with programs in Chapters 201, 204, and 205.

# EMERGENCY IMMIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM
(CFDA 84.162)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 98-151, further continuing appropriation for FY 1984 (Expired September 30, 1984.)

Funding Since 1984:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1984 | $ 0 1/ | $ 30,000,000 |

Purpose: This program provides financial assistance to State and local educational agencies for supplementary educational services and costs for immigrant children enrolled in elementary and secondary public and non-public schools.

Eligible Recipients: States are eligible for grants under the Emergency Immigrant Education program. Assistance will be distributed among LEAs within the State on the basis of the number of immigrant children.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A., B., and D., E., F.

No information

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Costs: In FY 1984, $3 million was awarded through grants to 28 State Education Agencies. The distribution of grant awards fell into the following categories: five grants under $100,000; 15 grants between $100,000 to $500,000; four awards between $500,000 and $1 million; and four awards of $1 million and more. For the 1984-85 school year, the Emergency Immigrant Education program will spend approximately $86 per immigrant child. This amount is based on the total funds awarded to local districts divided by the number of immigrant children served.

Students Served: The Emergency Immigrant Education Assistance appropriation serves 242,212 immigrant students in 28 States during the school year 1984-85.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

Not applicable

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Jonathan Chang, (202) 245-2822
Program Studies: Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401

Note

1. The U.S. House of Representatives passed H.R. 3520 in FY 1984 authorizing this legislation. The Senate never passed a comparable bill. As a result, although an appropriation was made in FY 1984, the program was never authorized.

# OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

# AID TO STATES FOR EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED IN STATE OPERATED AND STATE SUPPORTED SCHOOLS (CFDA No. 84.009)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 89-313, ESEA Title I, Sections 146-147 as amended by P.L. 93-380, P.L. 95-561 and P.L. 96 46, (20 USC 2771-2772) and as consolidated by P.L. 97-35, ECIA Chapter 1, Section 554(a)(2)(B) (20 U.S.C. 3803(a)(2)(B)). (Expires September 30, 1987)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 150,000,000 | $ 145,000,000 |
| 1981 | 165,000,000 | 156,625,000 |
| 1982 | 171,092,000 | 146,520,000 |
| 1983 | 146,520,000 | 146,520,000 |
| 1984 | 146,520,000 | 146,520,000 |

Purpose: To provide Federal assistance to State agencies which are directly responsible for providing free public education to handicapped children.

Restrictions on use of funds: State agencies are authorized to use these funds only for programs and projects that are designed to meet the special education and related service needs of handicapped children. Handicap categories include mental retardation, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, deaf-blind, specific learning disabilities, multihandicapped, and other health impairments requiring special education.

Formula: Each State's share is determined by a statutory formula. This formula is based upon the number of eligible handicapped children counted in average daily attendance (ADA), multiplied by 40 percent of the average State per-pupil expenditure (but no less than 80 percent or more than 120 percent of the national per-pupil expenditure). The amount for the State is reduced in proportion to the appropriation for the program.

Eligible Children: Children in State-operated or State-supported programs, and handicapped children in local education agencies (LEAs) are eligible if the following conditions are met:

- The child must have been reported previously in the ADA of a State agency.
- The child must be currently enrolled in an appropriately designed special educational program in the LEA.
- The LEA must receive from the State agency an amount equal to what the State agency receives from the Federal Government for the children.

Administration: This is a State-administered program. Applications for project funds are submitted by participating institutions and schools to their supervising State agency. Those applications approved by a State agency are forwarded to the State educational agency (SEA) for final approval and release of funds. All participating institutions and schools must submit end-of-year reports to their State agencies accounting for the expenditure of funds and providing an evaluation of project activities.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)

### A. Goals and Objectives:

During FY 1984 the Department's principal objective for this program was to continue financial assistance to States to assist them in providing services to eligible handicapped children.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments:

The children served through the program tend to be more severely handicapped than children supported under Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Under this program the State can obtain a higher Federal contribution per child than under the Part B program.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Services: Funding in FY 1984 provided services for about 247,000 children in programs administered by 135 State agencies.

Expenditures: The average Federal per-pupil contribution was $592.50 in FY 1984.

Children Served: Children benefiting under the program in 1983 were distributed across the following categories: Mentally Retarded - 97,452; Deaf-Blind - 1,087; Orthopedically Impaired - 11,010; Other Health Impaired 5,045; Visually Handicapped 10,330; Speech Impaired 15,880; Specific Learning Disabled 22,585; Hard of Hearing 4,303; Deaf 21,312; Emotionally Disturbed 41,474; and Multihandicapped 16,808 (E.1).

State Administration: New procedures in SEAs emphasize the total special education program, and ensure systematic monitoring of providers for compliance with State and Federal requirements. This includes procedures for ensuring fulfillment of the P.L. 93-380 local educational agency transfer provisions. Fiscal accountability is maintained in most States by more than one State agency, with at least one being the SEA. (E.2)

Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services program data.

2. Assessment of Educational Programs in State Supported and State Operated Schools, by Rehab Group, Inc., Falls Church, Virginia, September 1979.

F. Other Supporting Data: None.

## III. Response to GEPA 417 (b)

An "Assessment of the Chapter 1 Grants Program for the Handicapped" began in late FY 1984. This study will provide descriptive information on the operation of the P.L. 89-313 program relative to the P.L. 94-142 program, and will examine the feasibility of the Department of Education's conducting a large-scale national evaluation of the program. Preliminary results are due in FY 1985.

Contacts for further information

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Program Operations: | Bill Wolf, | (202) 732-1009 |
| Program Studies: | Eugene Tucker, | (202) 245-8364 |

# HANDICAPPED SCHOOL PROGRAMS
(CFDA No. 84.027)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part B, P.L. 91-230, as amended, (20 U.S.C. 1401 and 1411). (Expires September 30, 1986.)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | 1/ | $ 874,500,000 |
| 1981 | 1/ | 874,500,000 |
| 1982 | $ 969,850,000 2/ | 931,008,000 |
| 1983 | 1,017,900,000 2/ | 1,017,900,000 |
| 1984 | 1,068,875,000 2/ | 1,068,900,000 |

Purpose: To help States make available a free, appropriate public education for all handicapped children. The program awards grants to States to help State and local educational agencies pay for special education and related services to handicapped children, aged 3 to 21. These services must be provided in the least restrictive environment and in accordance with an "Individualized Education Program," which defines the child's unique educational needs. The law also establishes due process safeguards so beneficiaries can challenge the manner in which school districts provide a free appropriate public education.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

The four continuing goals of the program are designed to enforce compliance with the Law:

- To ensure that all handicapped children have available a free, appropriate public education, which includes special education and related services designed to meet unique needs.
- To protect the rights of handicapped children and their parents.
- To provide for the education of all handicapped children by assisting States and localities.
- To assess and ensure the effectiveness of State and local educational efforts for handicapped children.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

The program's progress and accomplishments are detailed in its annual report to Congress (E.1.)

B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

In summary, there are three indicators of progress relating to the goal of ensuring that the unique needs of handicapped children are met (E.2.):

- The number of handicapped children receiving special education services rose from 4,052,576 in school year 1982-83 to 4,094,108 in 1983-84. (See Section II. C.)
- The number of preschool-age handicapped children served increased by less than 1 percent from school year 1982-83 to 1983-84.
- The number of handicapped children, ages 18 through 21, served increased by 7 percent from school year 1982-83 to 1983-84.

Progress concerning the program's purposes to protect the rights of handicapped children; to assist States and localities in educating handicapped children; and to ensure effectiveness of State and local efforts can be seen in the following two indicators (E.2.):

- The triennial review of State plans completed this year identified and resolved issues involving procedural safeguards, e.g., inconsistency in administrative processes; educational environment; right to education; participation of private school children; and confidentiality.
- The Federal assistance provided this year was only 8 percent of the excess average per student costs, or about $248 per pupil, associated with educating handicapped children.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: Since the implementation of the Education For All Handicaped Children Act, the number of children served has continued to grow from 3,485,000 in 1976-77 to an estimated 4,094,108 in 1983-84. There have been some notable changes in the number of children with certain handicapping conditions receiving special education and related services since the first child count was taken in 1976-77. The most dramatic change occured in the learning disabled category: since 1976-77, a growth of 125 percent. In school year 1983-84, the children in the following categories were served. (E.1 and 2.)

| Handicapping Condition | Percentage of Population, Ages 5-17 | Number of Children, Ages 3-21 |
|---|---|---|
| Learning Disabled | 3.99 | 1,788,866 |
| Speech Impaired | 2.49 | 1,114,689 |
| Mentally Retarded | 1.45 | 653,082 |
| Emotionally Disturbed | .71 | 320,599 |
| Other Health Impaired | .11 | 49,615 |
| Multi-handicapped | .11 | 50,706 |
| Hard of Hearing and Deaf | .10 | 48,659 |
| Orthopedically Impaired | .10 | 45,119 |
| Visually Handicapped | .04 | 21,246 |
| Deaf-Blind | .00 | 1,447 |
| TOTAL | 9.14 | 4,094,108 |

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

The Federal funding share per child has also continued to grow from $72 in FY 1977 to $261 in FY 1984. (E. 1 and 2.)

The following table summarizes these trends:

| Fiscal Year | Child Count | Funding | Share Per Child |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1977 | 3,485,000 | $ 251,796,927 | $ 72 |
| 1978 | 3,561,000 | 566,030,074 | 159 |
| 1979 | 3,700,000 | 804,000,000 | 217 |
| 1980 | 3,803,000 | 874,500,000 | 230 |
| 1981 | 3,941,000 | 874,500,000 | 222 |
| 1982 | 3,990,000 | 931,008,000 | 233 |
| 1983 | 4,053,000 | 1,017,900,000 | 251 |
| 1984 | 4,094,100 | 1,068,900,000 | 261 |

There have been no new studies of the program's effectiveness.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None at this time.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. U.S. Department of Education, "Sixth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of P.L. 94-142: The Education of all Handicapped Children Act, 1984." (Also, previous annual reports.)
2. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services Program data.

F. Other Supporting Data

Not available. Studies mentioned last year still under way.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No new information.

Further Information Contacts

Program operations: Bob Walling, (202) 732-1238
Program studies: Garrett Coleman (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. The authorization level was determined by multiplying the number of handicapped children (aged 3-21) by 30 percent of average per person expenditures for FY 1980; and by 40 percent for FY 1981.
2. This authorization was established by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981.

# STATE INCENTIVE GRANTS FOR PRESCHOOL SERVICES TO HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (CFDA No. 84.027)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part B, Section 619, P.L. 91-230 as amended, (20 U.S.C. 1419). (permanent authorization.)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | 1/ | $25,000,000 |
| 1981 | 1/ | 25,000,000 |
| 1982 | $25,000,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 1983 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 |
| 1984 | 1/ | 26,330,000 |

Purpose: To encourage State and local education agencies to expand educational services to handicapped preschool children, from birth through age five.

Eligibility: State education agencies in the 50 states, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, Virgin Islands, and Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands must establish their eligibility to participate in the program. To establish eligibility, States must:

- Have in effect a policy that assures all handicapped children a free appropriate public education.
- Have on file in the Department of Education an approved State plan to provide such services.
- Already be providing services to preschool handicapped children.

Distribution of Funds: Grants to States are determined by an annual count of handicapped children ages three through five who are receiving special education and related services. State education agencies may use funds received under this program to provide direct services or they may contract with local education agencies, intermediate units, or other agencies to provide such services.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

For Fiscal Year 1984, the Department's principal objective was to award grants to encourage States to expand educational programs to handicapped preschool children from birth through age five.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

Fifty-five grants were made under this program with the FY 1984 appropriation. Grants were made to 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

This is the first year of operation under the amended legislation. The new legislation changed the age range of students served from three through five years of age to birth through five years of age.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: During the 1984-85 school year, 243,000 children are receiving services under the Incentive Grants program at a cost of $108 per child.

Program Scope: During the program's first year of operation, fewer than half of the State education agencies chose to participate; since then participation has grown. Currently 55 of 57 eligible agencies are participating. Also, since the first year of the program, funds available have grown from $12,500,000 to $26,330,000.

Program Services: Preschool Incentive Grant funds are used in numerous ways, depending on State needs. These funds were used last year for direct services to preschool handicapped children, to develop collaborative interagency agreements, to create statewide networks of technical assistance centers, to provide comprehensive diagnostic assessments, for parent training and counseling programs, for inservice training of administrative and ancillary personnel, and to provide partial support for development of instructional television programs for teachers and support staff.

Program Effectiveness: The number of handicapped children, ages three through five, receiving services increased from approximately 196,000 in 1977 to 243,000 as reported in the June 25, 1984 child count (E.1). Despite this progress, a considerable number of eligible handicapped preschool children could not find appropriate services due in part to varying State mandates. Currently 42 States mandate services to at least some portion of handicapped children five years and below. Department staff expect that the broadened definition of eligible children (birth through 5 years) will increase the number of children served.

Effectiveness of Services: No data are available.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Sixth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of P.L. 94-142: The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, January 1984.

## F. Other Supporting Data

Children Served, Funding, and Average Costs for the Preschool Program:

| Years of Appropriation | Child Count | Funding | Share per Child |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1980 | 232,000 | $25,000,000 | $108 |
| 1981 | 234,000 | 25,000,000 | 107 |
| 1982 | 228,000 | 24,000,000 | 105 |
| 1983 | 242,000 | 25,000,000 | 103 |
| 1984 | 243,000 | 26,330,000 | 108 |

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Sheila Friedman, (202) 732-1055
Program Studies: Tetsuo Okada, (202) 245-8877

Note:

1. Authorization level for the program is determined by an entitlement formula; each State receives $300 (reduced according to the proportion of funds actually appropriated by Congress) for every handicapped child, ages 3 through 5, who is receiving special education and related services.

# HANDICAPPED REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS
# (CFDA 84.028)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Section 621, Part C, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 98-199, (20 U.S.C. 1421). (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 21,000,000 | $ 9,750,000 |
| 1981 | 24,000,000 | 7,656,000 |
| 1982 | 9,800,000 | 2,880,000 |
| 1983 | 9,800,000 | 4,130,000 |
| 1984 | 5,700,000 | 5,700,000 |

Purpose: To establish regional resource centers which provide advice and technical services to educators for improving education of handicapped children.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education; private nonprofit organizations; State education agencies; or combinations of those agencies and institutions. Such a combination may include one or more local education agencies within particular regions of the United States.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

Each Regional Resource Center (RRC) must -

- Assist States, through services such as consultation, technical assistance, and training, to provide more effectively special education and related services to handicapped children and youth;
- Assist in identifying and solving persistent problems in providing quality special education and related services to handicapped children and youth;
- Assist in developing, identifying, and replicating successful programs and practices which will improve special education and related services to handicapped children and youth and their families;
- Gather and disseminate information to all State educational agencies in the region and coordinate activities with other Regional Resource Centers and with other relevant projects conducted by the Department of Education; and

- Assist in the improvement of information dissemination to, and training activities for, professionals and parents of handicapped children.

A Regional Resource Center may conduct research, innovation, training, or dissemination activities, consistent with the purposes of Section 624 of the Act and the requirements in 34 CFR Part 315.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1984, the program supported six regional centers that help SEAs and LEAs develop quality programs and services for handicapped children. The Department has identified five principal areas in which the States need technical assistance as:

- Secondary education and transition
- Preschool education
- Special education/general education coordination
- Parental involvement
- Technology

During FY 1984, the RRC program continued to provide technical assistance to States in these areas. One method was the development and dissemination of products that compile information on issues, practices, and materials. Another was the conduct of national and regional conferences. These were attended by about 3,000 persons. A third programmatic activity offered technical assistance to individual SEAs within each region. Examples of this effort, by region, include:

- The South Atlantic RRC designed and implemented a training program for assessment personnel in the State of Texas.

- The Northeast RRC assisted the Maine SEA in promoting the use of conflict resolution.

- The Great Lakes Area RRC works with its SEAs in the evaluation of State programs.

- The Mid-South RRC has established an electronic bulletin board to rapidly disseminate information.

- The Western RRC has helped the Alaska SEA to improve vocational education for the handicapped.

- The Mountain Plains RRC has assisted the Bureau of Indian Affairs to improve instructional quality.

C., D., E., F.

No new information.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (b)

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Etta Waugh, (202) 732-1052

Program studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

# HANDICAPPED INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS -- DEAF BLIND CENTERS
(CFDA No. 84.025)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part C, Section 622, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 98-199 (20 U.S.C. 1422). (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 26,000,000 | $ 16,000,000 |
| 1981 | 29,000,000 | 16,000,000 |
| 1982 | 16,000,000 | 15,360,000 |
| 1983 | 16,000,000 | 15,360,000 |
| 1984 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 |

Purpose: To support projects that enhance service to deaf-blind children and youth, particularly by providing technical assistance to State educational agencies and others who are involved in the education of deaf-blind children and youth.

Eligibility: Public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, or organizations.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the program went through a major change of focus as a result of revised legislation. Effects of this change are reflected in grants made in FY 1984.

The Department's first priority is to provide funds to ensure that States will have the necessary capability to provide appropriate services to those deaf-blind children for whom they are not required to make available a free appropriate public education under Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act, or some other authority.

The Department's second priority for the use of funds is the provision of technical assistance to State educational agencies.

Any remaining project funds may be used by grantees to provide supplementary services to deaf-blind children and youth not covered by the first priority.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1984 approximately $14,939,000 was awarded for the FY 1984 cooperative agreements, contracts, and grants. Awards were made for a period of up to three years, as follows:

| Priority Area | Approximate Funding Level | No. of Awards |
|---|---|---|
| Services for Deaf-Blind Children and Youth (34 CFR 307.11) | $8,281,000 | 23 |
| Technical Assistance to Entities Providing Services to Deaf-Blind Children and Youth (34 CFR 307.12) | 2,967,000 | 1 |
| Services to Deaf-Blind Youth Upon Attaining the Age of 22 (34 CFR 307.13) | 715,000 | 1 |
| Continuation of Demonstration and Other Projects | 3,037,000 | 22 |

## C., D., E., F.

No new information.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information:

Program operations: Charles Freeman, (202) 732-1165

Program Studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

# EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.204)

## 1. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part C, Section 623, P.L. 91-230 as amended, (20 U.S.C. 1423). (Expires September 30, 1986.)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $25,000,000 | $20,000,000 |
| 1981 | 20,000,000 | 17,500,000 |
| 1982 | 20,000,000 | 16,800,000 |
| 1983 | 20,000,000 | 16,800,000 |
| 1984 | 26,000,000 | 21,100,000 |

Purpose: To support the development, demonstration, dissemination, and research on experimental educational practices that meet the needs of preschool handicapped children.

Eligibility: Public agencies and private non-profit organizations are eligible for contracts and grants. Only State education agencies or other State agencies may receive State planning grants.

Program Components: The program supports five types of contracts and grants:

- Demonstration grants to develop service-delivery models based on outstanding practices.
- Outreach grants to disseminate model programs and help new sites adopt and implement them.
- State planning grants to assist State agencies in planning, developing, and providing services to preschool handicapped children from birth through age five.
- Special project contracts to provide support services to other program components.
- Research Institute contracts to conduct long-term research into the problems of young children.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

The major change in the Early Childhood Education program resulting from the Education of the Handicapped Amendments of 1983 was the increased emphasis on support for State educational agencies under the State planning

A. Goals and Accomplishments (Continued)

grants component (formerly State Implementation Grants). For FY 1984, specific objectives for program components were:

- To fund new projects that demonstrate local/State/regional coordination among agencies, and serve children from birth to 3 years of age;
- To fund new outreach projects and encourage grantees to obtain approval from the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP); and
- To fund State planning projects that are comprehensive and include interagency coordination.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1984 this program supported the following projects:

| Type of Project | New | Continuing | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|
| Demonstration | 30 | 53 | 83 |
| Outreach | 34 | 0 | 34 |
| State Planning | 27 | 27 | 54 |
| Special Projects | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Research Institutes | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| TOTAL | 92 | 84 | 176 |

According to program staff, demonstration projects serve children from birth to 6 years of age and 41 percent of the projects represent joint efforts by universities, LEAs, SEAs, State agencies, and hospitals. Program staff also report that 11 percent of the outreach projects have received JDRP approval. Finally, State planning projects awarded in FY 1984 included joint working relationships among State agencies and better use of existing resources.

## C., D., E., F.

No new information.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

Research institutes will continue to measure effects of early interventions.

## Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Paul Ackerman, (202) 732-1155
Program Studies: Tetsuo Okada, (202) 245-8877

# INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS FOR SEVERELY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.086)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part C, Section 624, Public Law 91-230, as amended (20 USC 1424). (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | 1/ | $5,000,000 |
| 1981 | 1/ | 4,375,000 |
| 1982 | $5,000,000 | 2,880,000 |
| 1983 | 5,000,000 | 2,880,000 |
| 1984 | 5,000,000 | 4,300,000 |

Purpose: To improve and expand innovative educational and training services for severely handicapped children and youth and to improve the acceptance of such people by the general public, professionals, and potential employers.

Eligibility and Awards: Public and private agencies, organizations, or institutions, including State departments of special education, intermediate or local education agencies, institutions of higher education, professional organizations, and volunteer associations. Competitions are held annually for new awards and for continuations for up to three years.

Contractor and Grantee Activities: Contractors and grantees develop or refine instrumentation for the identification and diagnosis of severely handicapped children and youth; develop or refine curriculum or techniques for serving those children; and package and disseminate products of model projects.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department continued the same priorities established for FY 1983:

- To implement the Secretary's Initiative emphasizing the placing of handicapped youngsters in the least restrictive environments for services, with special attention on the severely handicapped.
- To support programs emphasizing parent involvement.
- To solicit non-directed demonstration projects of innovative services for the severely handicapped.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

During FY 1984, the Department:

- funded model demonstration projects for the integration of severely handicapped children into settings with less- and non-handicapped persons; for deinstitutionalization; for improvement of daily living skills; and for development of vocational training in technological skill areas.
- provided guidance and other services to parents of severely handicapped children.
- made awards to develop innovative techniques for early identification of children who may need special education services due to the severity of their handicapping condition.

## C.. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: Approximately 4,700 youngsters are served in demonstration projects.

Effectiveness: There are no current, effectiveness data about these projects. The Department will summarize, in FY 1986, information currently being collected on the program.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

No recommendations for legislative change.

## E. Supporting Study and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

None.

## F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are currently in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Freeman, (202) 732-1165

Program Studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

### Note

1. No funds were authorized separately for this program. Funding was provided based on the amounts authorized for other Part C activities related to Section 624 activities.

# POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED PERSONS
(CFDA No. 84.078)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part C, Section 625, Public Law 91-230, as amended (20 USC 1424a). (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $14,000,000 | $2,400,000 |
| 1981 | 16,000,000 | 2,950,000 |
| 1982 | 4,000,000 | 2,832,000 |
| 1983 | 4,000,000 | 2,832,000 |
| 1984 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |

Purpose: To develop and operate specially designed or modified programs of vocational, technical, postsecondary, or adult education for deaf or other handicapped persons.

Eligibility and Awards: State educational agencies, institutions of higher education, including junior and community colleges, vocational and technical institutions, and other appropriate nonprofit educational agencies. Grants and contracts are typically awarded for up to three years. Priority is given to programs serving multistate or interstate regions or large population centers; programs adapting existing programs of vocational-technical, postsecondary, or adult education to the special needs of handicapped persons; and programs designed to serve areas where a need for such services is clearly demonstrated.

Grantee or Contractor Activities: Funds support two types of activities: direct services (supported by grants to postsecondary or vocational institutions) to deaf students, and demonstration projects (under grants and contract) to develop innovative models for services to postsecondary and adult handicapped students.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objective for this program was to solicit grant applications from a large range of institutions, including some new applicants.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

- In FY 1984, the Department received 112 applications for new projects, many from organizations that had not previously participated in this program.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Scope: In 1984, four continuation grants were awarded to centers serving deaf students. Program staff estimate that approximately 600 students were served by interpreters, note-takers, or other assistants. These annual grants ranged from $400,000 to $600,000. Seventeen new demonstration grants benefiting learning disabled and mildly mentally retarded individuals were awarded, with an average award of $132,500.

In 1984, no contracts were awarded.

Effectiveness: No data on effectiveness are available.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above:

None.

## F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Joe Rosenstein, (202) 732-1176

Program studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

# TRAINING PERSONNEL FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED
## (CFDA No. 84.029)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part D, Sections 631, 632, and 634, P.L. 91-230, as amended, (20 U.S.C. 1431, 1432, 1434) (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $85,000,000 | $55,375,000 |
| 1981 | 90,000,000 | 43,500,000 |
| 1982 | 58,000,000 | 49,300,000 |
| 1983 | 58,000,000 | 49,300,000 |
| 1984 | 58,000,000 | 55,540,000 |

Purpose: To provide fully trained and certified special education teachers including early childhood specialists, administrators and supervisors, speech-language pathologists, audiologists, physical educators and educational educators; to train doctoral and postdoctoral teacher trainers, researchers, and administrators; to train paraprofessionals, career educators, recreation specialists, health services personnel, school psychologists, social service providers, physical and occupational therapists; to develop innovative instructional models for use by providers of preservice and inservice training; and to train parents of handicapped children and youth.

Uses of Project Funds: Grants may be used for undergraduate and graduate students, traineeships, and special projects. Funds may be obligated for student stipends, dependency allowances, or program support.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- Shift the program emphasis to preservice training and parent training more.
- Modify regulations to emphasize new priorities and areas of personnel shortages.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Roughly 95% of funded projects support preservice training. Projects on parent training and information increased in number from 19 to 61.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

- ED modified the program regulations to give training priority to (1) personnel in special education, leadership roles, related services, transition efforts, handicapped infant services, rural areas, and minority groups; (2) SEA programming, parent training and information services, and special projects, and (3) areas of personnel shortages.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: The Department supports 862 projects which represent training efforts in each State and three of the territories. In fiscal year 1984, ED funded 307 new projects and 555 continuation projects.

The following chart identifies FY 1984 awards by priority area.

New and Continuation Awards In FY 1984

| Priority Category | Number of Projects |
|---|---|
| Special Educators | 501 |
| Related Service Personnel | 53 |
| Leadership Personnel | 87 |
| Regular Educators | 25 |
| Volunteers | 13 |
| SEAs | 47 |
| Special Projects | 66 |
| Transition Efforts | 9 |
| Parent Projects | 61 |

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program Files, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

## F. Other Supporting Data

No information is available on the sex or race of trainees in this program. However, many of the projects targeted traditionally under-represented groups. In Fiscal Year 1984 there were--

- 19 projects at Historically Black Institutions
- 23 projects training Native Americans
- 11 projects training bilingual/bicultural populations.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

Case Study of Selected Sites Training Special Educators of the Handicapped - being prepared by ED staff.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Max Mueller, (202) 245-9886

Program studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

# HANDICAPPED TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND INFORMATION (CFDA No. 84.030)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part D, Section 633, P.L. 91-230, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1433). (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $2,500,000 | $1,000,000 |
| 1981 | 2,500,000 | 750,000 |
| 1982 | 1,000,000 | 720,000 |
| 1983 | 1,000,000 | 720,000 |
| 1984 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |

Purpose: To disseminate information, to provide referral services and resources for the education of handicapped children, and to encourage students to work in various fields of special education.

Funding Mechanisms: Competitive contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To revise the regulations to incorporate provisions in new legislation (Public Law 98-199) regarding eligibility for funding and scope of the clearinghouse activities.
- To provide information about services and programs in postsecondary education for the handicapped.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- ED published revised regulations (1) to make only non-profit and public organizations eligible for grants and cooperative agreements while profit-making organizations are eligible for contracts and (2) to clarify the role of a national clearinghouse in postsecondary education.
- ED awarded two cooperative agreements, one for a clearinghouse on education of the handicapped and one for a clearinghouse on postsecondary education for the handicapped.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

In the second year of its three-year contract, the National Information Center for Handicapped Children and Youth developed and mailed information sheets to more than 180,000 individuals or organizations, distributed two issues of its newsletter to 1500 recipients, responded to more than 10,000 inquiries, and sponsored three workshops for professionals or parents.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program files, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

### F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Helene Corradino, (202) 472-3740.

Program studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364.

# DISCRETIONARY GRANTS FOR HANDICAPPED--INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (CFDA No. 84.023)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part E, Sections 641 and 642, P.L. 91-230 as amended (20 U.S.C. 1441, 1442). (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $24,000,000 | $20,000,000 |
| 1981 | 26,000,000 | 15,000,000 |
| 1982 | 20,000,000 | 10,800,000 |
| 1983 | 20,000,000 | 12,000,000 |
| 1984 | 20,000,000 | 15,000,000 |

Purpose: To improve the education of handicapped children and youth through research and development projects, and model programs (demonstrations).

Eligibility: State and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public agencies or non-profit private educational or research agencies and organizations are eligible.

Allowable Activities: Recipients may use funds for research, surveys or demonstrations related to education of handicapped children and youth, including the development and conduct of model programs designed to meet the special education needs of such children.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

FY 84 funds were allocated according to the following funding categories:

1. Field Initiated Research: To provide grants for non-directed research into subjects suggested by applicants which are judged to be responsive to the educational needs of handicapped children and youth.
2. Handicapped Children's Model Program: To provide grants for demonstration projects (youth employment projects and postsecondary projects) which develop, demonstrate, evaluate, and disseminate innovative and exemplary services for handicapped children and youth.
3. Assessment Research: To award cooperative agreements for research to determine student outcomes, effectiveness of services, and validity of technqiues and instruments for assessment of handicapped children and youth.

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

4. Technology Research: To award cooperative agreements for research on handicapped students' use of technological devices and systems in schools.

5. Student Research: To award grants that provide research opportunities for graduate students to enhance their professional training.

6. Minority Research Institutes: To provide contracts for long-term research on programs to improve the education of handicapped children and youth who are members of minority groups.

7. Research Integration: To provide contracts for the analysis and synthesis of research findings and products which would in turn serve to identify future research and development activities.

8. Other Research Activities: To provide contracts for special-purpose research projects which relate directly to improving the education of handicapped children and youth.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The program awarded grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements as follows:

| Priority Area | Amount | Number of Awards |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Field Initiated Research | $6,860,000 | 82 |
| 2. Handicapped Children's Model Program | 2,724,000 | 27 |
| 3. Assessment Research | 835,000 | 3 |
| 4. Technology Research | 1,661,000 | 7 |
| 5. Student Research | 214,000 | 23 |
| 6. Minority Research Institute | 1,468,000 | 1 |
| 7. Research Integration | 456,000 | 1 |
| 8. Other Research Activities | 782,000 | 4 |

C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness

The outcomes of this program can be divided into three categories: (1) new or improved products (assessment instruments, instructional materials, technological devices/software); (2) research findings and new information; and (3) personnel trained in research methods.

1. Examples of new or improved products include:

   a. A project at Indiana University has developed a set of validated materials that teachers can use to increase academic learning time and academic achievement among mildly handicapped students. These materials include two teachers' manuals: one manual describes easy-to-use methods to determine the amount of academic learning time each student is engaged in during the class day; another manual provides teachers with different approaches that can be used to increase academic learning time and academic achievement. (E.1a)

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

b. A project at the University of Oregon has developed an instrument to assess various areas of handicapped infants and preschool children's development. The results can then be used to plan educational programs for individual children, to provide information about the progress of individual children and to indicate overall program effectiveness. (E.1b)

2. Examples of research findings include:

a. Several research projects have provided new information about teaching communication skills to autistic and other non-vocal handicapped children. In a study conducted at Purdue University, for example, findings were reported on the relative effectiveness of three non-speech communication systems in teaching non-vocal mentally retarded students to communicate. (E.2a)

b. A major project at the University of Minnesota examined many issues on the delivery of residential living and habilitative services to severely and profoundly handicapped children and youth. Findings about alternative, less restrictive arrangments for providing services to severely handicapped students were described in a project report. (E.2b)

c. The High/Scope Education Research Foundation has completed a study of the effects of preschool education. Following children from their preschool years into their adolescent years, the study found that those exposed to a preschool program perform at higher levels than those who had no preschool program. Using a variety of measures, the study has shown that intervention during the preschool years provides lasting, beneficial outcomes. (E.2c)

3. Research training: Since 1975 more than 300 graduate students in colleges and universities have received support through the student research program. In addition, at least half of all other supported research projects employ graduate students as research assistants, thus affording the students an opportunity to gain research experience on large scale research projects. Finally, as part of their work, the two minority research institutes are providing graduate students with research training as well as opportunities for participation in programmatic research activities. (E.3)

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1a. Final Report--G008001876 (Indiana University)
1b. Final Report--G008300033 (University of Oregon)
2a. Final Report--G008100027 (Purdue University)

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above (Continued)

2b. Final Report--G008100277 (University of Minnesota)
2c. Final Report--G008001873 (High/Scope Education Research Foundation)
3. Field Initiated Research Program, Quarterly Reports, March 1984.

F. Other Supporting Data

None

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Nancy Safer, (202) 732-1109
Program Studies: Elaine Green, (202) 245-8877

# DISCRETIONARY GRANTS FOR HANDICAPPED--MEDIA SERVICES AND CAPTIONED FILMS (CFDA No. 84.026)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part F, Sections 651-654, P.L. 91-230, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1451-1454). (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $27,000,000 | $19,000,000 |
| 1981 | 29,000,000 | 17,000,000 |
| 1982 | 19,000,000 | 11,520,000 |
| 1983 | 19,000,000 | 12,000,000 |
| 1984 | 19,000,000 | 14,000,000 |

Purpose:

- To contribute to the general welfare of deaf persons by (1) bringing to such persons understanding and appreciation of those films which play such an important part in the general and cultural advancement of hearing persons, (2) providing through these films enriched educational and cultural experiences, and (3) providing a wholesome and rewarding experience which deaf persons may share together.

- To promote the educational advancement of handicapped persons by (1) carrying on research in the use of educational media for the handicapped, (2) producing and distributing educational media for the use of handicapped persons and others who work with them, and (3) training persons in the use of educational media for the instruction of the handicapped.

Eligibility: Public and private agencies, profit and nonprofit organizations, or groups may submit proposals and applications for projects.

Allowable Activities: Contracts and grants may be given to conduct research into the use of educational media and technology for the handicapped. Contracts and grants also provide training in the use of educational media and technology for teachers, parents, and others who work with the handicapped. Contractors and grantees are further authorized to use funds to acquire, produce, and distribute films and other media and media equipment.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objective for this program was to fund three major program components: 1) captioning, 2) technology demonstration and development, and 3) educational media and materials centers as well as the National Theater for the Deaf, and Recordings for the Blind, Inc.

## A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

The specific objectives for each program component are:

1. Captioning: Increase accessibility of television and film to approximately 14 million deaf and hearing-impaired persons by developing, adapting, producing, and distributing materials that incorporate the most recent technological advancements in film and television.

2. Technology Development Projects: Improve the education, independent functioning and employment of handicapped individuals by assuring that the advances in educational technology are available, of good quality, and used appropriately. Funds support projects to improve software for use in special education programming for mild and moderately handicapped children, and to develop devices to compensate for a particular handicapping condition which might impede the educational achievement.

3. Educational Media and Materials Centers: Improve the availability of quality materials for handicapped children, their parents, and educators by designing, developing, adapting, and disseminating appropriate educational material and information.

4. National Theater of the Deaf: Provide support for the National Theater of the Deaf in order to (1) raise awareness about the capabilities and creativeness of handicapped persons and (2) provide for the educational and cultural advancement of deaf persons who participate with the National Theater.

5. Recordings for the Blind: Provide tape-recorded textbooks to help visually impaired students of all ages overcome barriers to learning.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

Funds for FY 84 were spent as follows:

| | Amount | No. of Projects |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Captioning | $ 9,204,994 | 62 |
| 2. Technology | 2,550,006 | 22 |
| 3. Media and Materials Centers | 1,205,000 | 3 |
| 4. National Theater of the Deaf | 500,000 | 1 |
| 5. Recordings for the Blind, Inc. | 540,000 | 1 |
| | $14,000,000 | 89 |

## C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness

The primary focus of this program has been on the captioning of films and television programs. Program funds have been instrumental in the development of the closed-captioning television system, enabling deaf and hearing-impaired persons to enjoy television on sets equipped with a special decoder unit.

## C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Individual areas of accomplishment are summarized below:

Captioning and Recording: Materials incorporating the most advanced technological achievements in television and recording have been developed, adapted, produced, and distributed. For example, captioned general-interest films were shown 68,502 times from October 1983 through March 1984. The total audience count was 1,096,032 for the same period. The average cost per film was approximately $25,800. Captioned educational films were shown 92,790 times between October 1983 and March 1984, to audiences totalling 1,020,025 children. Average cost per film was $6,778, as opposed to the previous year's $9,950. (E.1)

Technology Development Projects: New or improved existing methods, approaches, and techniques in media which contribute to the adjustment and education of all handicapped persons have been created. Under the Technology component seventeen research projects were funded to: examine and demonstrate the use of new advances; disseminate information about practices found effective; and train persons in the use of educational media and technology. One of these, The National Assistance Project for Special Education Technology, developed and field tested a model system of technical assistance. (E.2)

Educational Media and Materials Centers and Services: Specialized educational material and information for the handicapped, their parents and educators have been designed, developed, adapted, and disseminated. For example, the Center to Increase State Capacity Related to Technology Application in Special Education conducted a symposium on the application of technology in special education; provided training for State directors; and provided assistance to the staff at the Model Secondary School for the Deaf. (E.3)

Another project, the Market Linkage Project for Special Education (LINC) serves as the major vehicle for marketing materials and products for the handicapped. An estimated 250,000 school-age children have benefited from the placement of products into commercial and national distribution through this project. LINC also serves as a resource to other projects. (E.4)

National Theater of the Deaf: The self-image and the popular image of the deaf have been enhanced through the presentation of plays by deaf actors and actresses. This company presents productions throughout the United States and Europe.

Recordings for the Blind: Recorded textbooks have been provided to visually impaired learners. This organization distributes about 90,000 recorded books to students, and records 4,000 new texts each year.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Annual report of the contractor, Modern Talking Picture Service, the Distribution Service for Captioned Films, October 1984.

2. Final Report, Center to Increase State Capacity Related to Technology Application in Special Education, National Association of State Directors of Special Education 1984.

3. Annual Report, Council on Exceptional Children, 1984.

4. Market Reports, Market Linkage Project for Special Education, October 1984.

## F. Other Supporting Data

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Bill Wolf, (202) 732-1009
Program Studies: Elaine Green, (202) 245-8877

# EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT--SPECIAL STUDIES
## (CFDA 84.159)

## 1. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part B, Section 618, P.L. 91-230, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1418). (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | Indefinite | $1,000,000 |
| 1981 | " | 1,000,000 |
| 1982 | $2,300,000 | 480,000 |
| 1983 | 2,300,000 | 480,000 |
| 1984 | 3,100,000 | 3,070,000[1] |

Purpose: The purpose of the Special Studies activity is twofold:

1. To assess progress in the implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), to assess the impact of the Act, and to assess the effectiveness of State and local efforts to provide free appropriate public education to all handicapped children and youth; and

2. To provide the Congress with information for policy making and to provide Federal, State, and local educational agencies with information relevant to program management, administration, and effectiveness.

Method of Operation: The Department awards contracts, grants and cooperative agreements late in each fiscal year and most supported activities occur in the subsequent year.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

Priorities for FY 84 were:

- To initiate studies mandated by the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1983, P.L. 98-199.
- To initiate cooperative agreements with State education agencies to assess the impact and effectiveness of programs assisted under the EHA.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Three new studies responding to the mandate will examine per pupil expenditures for special education and related services; begin a longitudinal study of the occupational, educational, and independent living status of a sample of handicapped children and youth; and describe State and local expenditures on special education.

B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

- o Eleven new cooperative agreements with State Education Agencies will assess the impact and effectiveness of programs assisted under the EHA.

C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Cost:

| Studies (expenditures) | Amount | Number |
|---|---|---|
| A. Annual Report | | |
| 1. Fast response network | | |
| New: | | |
| Continuation: | $ 186,000 | 1 |
| 2. TA in data analysis | | |
| New: | 397,000 | 1 |
| Continuation: | 32,000 | 1 |
| 3. ADP support (ED) | 30,000 | 1 |
| B. Special Evaluation Studies | | |
| 1. Longitudinal/child program* | | |
| New: | 285,000 | 1 |
| 2. Special education expenditures* | | |
| New: | 505,000 | 1 |
| 3. Financing Free, Appropriate | | |
| Public Education | | 1 |
| New: | 325,000 | |
| 4. High School & Beyond (OPBE) | 30,000 | 1 |
| C. Federal/State Evaluations | | |
| 1. Cooperative agreements | | |
| New: | 1,262,000 | 11 |
| TOTAL | $3,052,000 | 19 |

*Mandated

Benefits and Effectiveness: Federal and State staff have used the results of studies funded by this program for technical assistance, training and public information to carry out the State Grant Program and the Preschool Incentive Grants Program. Studies also provide the basis for the Annual Report to Congress (mandated by Section 618 of P.L. 94-142) describing the

### C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

progress being made toward serving handicapped children. In addition, Department and Congressional staff have used data from studies conducted under this program to redirect program priorities of regional resource centers and deaf-blind centers away from the provision of direct services which overlap State responsibilities and toward providing technical assistance.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. "Education of the Handicapped Funding Priorities--December 13, 1984." The Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Program files.

### F. Other Supporting Data

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

### Contact for Further Information

Program Operations: Bill Wolf, (202) 732-1009
Program Studies: Elaine Green, (202) 245-8877

### Note:

1. Adjusted for comparative transfer of $30,000 to Department of Education, Departmental management, salaries and expenses. No adjustments are made for prior fiscal years.

# SECONDARY EDUCATION AND TRANSITIONAL SERVICES FOR HANDICAPPED YOUTH (CFDA 84.158)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part C Section 626, Public Law 98-199, (20 USC 1425, 1426 and 1427 and 29 USC 1501 and 777(a)) (Expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1984:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1984 | $ 6,000,000 | $ 6,000,000 |

Purpose: To strengthen and coordinate education, training, and related services for handicapped youth. To assist in the transitional process to postsecondary education, vocational training, competitive employment, continuing education, or adult services. To stimulate the improvement and development of programs for special education at the secondary level.

Application and Award Process: Grants or contracts are made to institutions of higher education, State or local education agencies, or other public and private non profit institutions or agencies (including the State job training coordinating councils and administrative entities established under the Job Training Partnership Act).

Duration and Phasing of Activities: Grants are made for one to three years.

## II. Response to GEPA 417 (a)

### A. Goals and Objectives:

During FY 1984 the Department's principal objectives for this program were:

- To publish regulations and grant application procedures in the Federal Register.
- To select and award the initial grants for the program.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- Grant application procedures were revised and published following comments and the release of final regulations.
- Initial grants were made to 50 successful applicants.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope and Costs: Fifty grants ranging from $50,000 to $200,000 each have been made.

Program Effectiveness: The program was initiated in 1984. Therefore no program effectiveness data are available.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

None.

## III. Response to GEPA 417 (b)

None.

Contracts for further information:

Program Operations: Nancy Safer, (202) 472-5040

Program Studies : Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HANDICAPPED RESEARCH
(CFDA No. 84.133)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II and Section 311(a), Public Law 98-221, (29 USC 760-762 and 777a(a)). (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $75,000,000 | $31,487,500 |
| 1981 | 90,000,000 | 29,750,000 |
| 1982 | 35,000,000 | 28,560,000 |
| 1983 | 35,000,000 | 31,560,000 1/ |
| 1984 | 36,000,000 | 36,000,000 |

Purpose: To support research and its utilization to improve the lives of the physically and mentally handicapped, especially those who are severely disabled, and to provide for the administration and conduct of rehabilitation research and the dissemination of information to rehabilitation professionals and handicapped persons concerning developments in rehabilitation procedures, methods, and devices.

Organization: NIHR's research activities are conducted primarily through "center" programs, each with a core area of investigation. These programs include Research and Training Centers and Rehabilitation Engineering Centers. Other programs include national and international research, demonstrations, and utilization projects. In FY 1984, NIHR established the Field-Initiated Research Program to fund grants in areas not included in regularly announced priorities. In 1983 it began the Mary E. Switzer Research Fellowship Program to provide fellowships for scientific research on solutions to the rehabilitation problems of disabled persons. NIHR also has the responsibility for promoting coordination and cooperation among Federal agencies conducting rehabilitation research through an Interagency Committee on Handicapped Research.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984 the Department's principal objectives for this program were:

- To undertake a major revision of NIHR's long range research plan to guide its research activities (E-1).

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

- To administer Model Spinal Cord Injury Projects, previously administered by the Rehabilitation Services Administration.
- To establish an interagency rehabilitation research information system.
- To establish two new Research and Training Centers--one for pediatrics and one for disabled Pacific Basin residents.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Progress has been made on the major revision of the long-range plan for rehabilitation research, with emphasis on the priority areas of mental illness, mental retardation, vocational rehabilitation, independent living, development of technological systems, private sector involvement in device development, network development for dissemination and utilization of research findings, and continuing research and development programs (E.1).
- NIHR conducted two grant competitions for Model Spinal Cord Injury Projects; 17 awards were made.
- An Interagency Rehabilitation Research Information System was established--data are being collected.
- Two Research and Training Centers were established, one in Pediatrics (University of Connecticut), and the other for Pacific Basin disabled persons (University of Hawaii).

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope and Costs:

The numbers of funded projects for NIHR's major programs are shown in the table.

| | Actual | | Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 |
| Number Funded: | 101 | 161 | 157 |
| Research and Training Centers (RTC) | 31 | 35 | 33 |
| Rehabilitation Engineering Centers (REC) | 18 | 16 | 16 |
| Research and Utilization Projects (RVP) | 35 | 47 | 37 |
| Field-Initiated Projects (FIP) | - | 46 | 56 |
| Fellowships | 17 | 17 | 15 |
| Model Spinal Cord Projects | - | 17 | 10 |

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness: (Continued)

Some 450 individual studies are under way at any given time, and 600 training programs serving approximately 60,000 participants are conducted annually (E-2).

The NIHR appropriation for FY 1984 was $36 million. Of this, approximately $16.4 million was devoted to the RTC program; $7.9 million to the REC program; $3.5 million to discrete grants and contracts for research; and $2.8 million for research utilization. Field-initiated research accounted for $4.1 million, $500,000 went for fellowships; and $800,000 for related activities. RSA supported Model Spinal Cord Injury Projects at $5.0 million (E.2).

## Research and Training Centers Program (RTC)

Of the 35 RTCs funded in FY 1984, 12 are medical RTCs. Their work covers such areas as cardiopulmonary disease, spinal cord injury, health care delivery, special problems of the severely impaired, biofeedback, and neuromuscular dysfunctions. There are five vocational rehabilitation RTCs, two on deafness, one on psychosocial research, two on mental illness, three on mental retardation, two on aging, one on independent living, one on blindness, two on Native Americans, three on pediatric rehabilitation, and one on rehabilitation of the disabled in the Pacific Basin.

## Rehabilitation Engineering Centers (REC)

Sixteen Rehabilitation Engineering Centers were funded in fiscal year 1984 with the purposes of: (1) developing innovative methods of applying advanced medical technology, scientific achievement, and psychiatric, psychological, and social knowledge to solve rehabilitation problems; (2) developing systems of technical and engineering information exchange; and (3) improving the distribution of technological devices and equipment to handicapped individuals.

The developments of these centers included: (1) a multi-channel electrical stimulation system that allows paraplegic patients to stand and walk, (2) eye glasses that protect the macula from irreversible damage from excessive light following optical surgery, and (3) utilization of industrial robots for assistance to severely disabled persons at the competitive work place (E-4).

## Discrete Grant Awards

Approximately $3.5 million was obligated through individual grant awards and contracts. Some individual grant awards were for research in the broad areas of psychological and medical problems, sensory disabilities, severe burns, and other specific problems. In addition, about $2.8 million was devoted to research utilization projects which mainly offer coordinated dissemination and information services, promote innovations in service programs based on R&D results, and instill an awareness of change processes (E-3).

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness: (Continued)

Program Effectiveness: The most recent study of the RTC program was completed in 1980 (E-2).

The most recent study of the Rehabilitation Engineering Center program was completed in 1981 (E-3). No current program effectiveness data are available.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C above

1. NIHR Long-Range Plan, 1980
2. "Research and Training Centers - Overview," 1980 in-house document.
3. "Rehabilitation Engineering Center Program Evaluation: Final Report. Berkeley Planning Associates, Berkeley, California, 1981.
4. "Goals and the Goal-Setting Processes in the Research and Training Program," Abt Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1982.

## F. Other Supporting Data

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

A new study of the RTCs is planned for FY 1985.

Contacts for further information:

Program Operations: Wilmer S. Hunt, (202) 732-1137
Betty Jo Berland, (202) 472-6551

Program Studies : Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

1. Includes a $1.5 million supplemental appropriation for the establishment of two Research and Training Centers. The awards for these centers--one for pediatrics and one for disabled Pacific Basin residents--were made in FY 1984.

## REHABILITATION SERVICES--BASIC SUPPORT
## (CFDA No. 84.126)

### I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title I, Part A, except Section 112, (29 U.S.C. 720). (Expires September 30, 1987.)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation[1] |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 880,000,000 | $ 817,484,000 |
| 1981 | 945,000,000 | 854,259,000 |
| 1982 | 899,000,000 | 863,040,000 |
| 1983 | 943,900,000 | 943,900,000 |
| 1984 | 1,037,800,000 | 1,037,800,000 |

Purpose: The purpose of this program is to provide vocational rehabilitation services to persons with mental and/or physical handicaps. Persons with the most severe disabilities receive services first.

Federal and State funds cover the costs of a wide variety of rehabilitation services: diagnosis; comprehensive evaluation; counseling; training; reader services for the blind; interpreter services for the deaf; medical and related services, such as prosthetic and orthopedic devices; transportation to secure vocational rehabilitation services; maintenance during rehabilitation; employment placement tools, licenses, equipment, supplies, and management services for vending stands or other small businesses for handicapped persons; assistance in the construction and establishment of rehabilitation facilities; and services to families of handicapped individuals when such services will contribute substantially to the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals.

Eligibility: States designate a sole agency to administer the program. Physical and/or mentally disabled individuals are eligible for services if their disabilities are a handicap to employment, and if rehabilitation services may improve their chances for employment.

Distribution of Funds: Federal funds are distributed to States based on population weighted by per capita income. The statistical factors for fund allocation are: 1) the three-year average of per capita income by state; 2) the total U.S. population; 3) State population; and 4) the Consumer Price Index.

### II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department had four goals for this program:

- o Employment: To increase the number of disabled individuals employed by encouraging State agencies to use better placement practices.

## A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

- Management: To improve the management of the service delivery system by 1) distributing information about effective evaluation and other management techniques; 2) enforcing Federal program regulations; and 3) providing technical assistance and management training to the personnel of organizations receiving program funds.

- Special Education--Rehabilitation Coordination: To improve services to disabled individuals from childhood through adulthood by: 1) identifying exemplary joint special education and rehabilitation programs; and 2) accelerating the transition of deaf-blind persons from special education to rehabilitation programs.

- Facilities: To increase rehabilitation facility use by developing and reviewing State facility plans and authorities, and by developing regulations and budget materials to implement legislation and maintaining liaison with various representatives of national organizations concerned with issues in use of facilities.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Employment: The Department has assisted State agencies to increase employment opportunities for the disabled in the private sector, including: 1) assisting in the development of several home-based employment programs; 2) improving State agency job placement units; and 3) providing information to businesses on the "Targeted Jobs Tax Credit."

- Management: The Department has completed a nationwide assessment of evaluation procedures and review instruments and will publish the report in January 1985. The Department also completed all scheduled technical assistance and training to individuals in grantee organizations.

- Special Education--Rehabilitation Coordination: The Department finished plans for identifying and encouraging replication of exemplary, joint special education and rehabilitation programs. Because of improved coordination, deaf-blind persons are moving more rapidly from special education to rehabilitation programs, according to a phone survey of States made by the Department's regional offices.

- Facilities: All State agencies have developed and updated State rehabilitation facilities plans. Regional offices have completed reviews of all State facility authorities. Various intergovernmental task force meetings have met to discuss facility plans.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

The distribution of the major disabling conditions of persons rehabilitated in Fiscal Year 1982, the last year for which these and other client characteristics data have been tabulated, is as follows:

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Characteristics of Rehabilitated Persons

| Type of Disability | Number | | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Blindness | 8,948 | | 4.2 |
| Other Visual Impairments | 10,113 | | 4.7 |
| Deafness | 6,423 | est. | 3.0 |
| Other Hearing Impairments | 9,096 | est. | 4.2 |
| Orthopedic Impairments | 50,071 | | 23.3 |
| Absence or Amputation of Extremities | 5,364 | | 2.5 |
| Mental Illness | 41,052 | | 19.1 |
| Alcoholism | 11,629 | | 5.4 |
| Drug Addiction | 2,753 | | 1.3 |
| Mental Retardation | 26,623 | | 12.4 |
| Hay Fever and Asthma | 1,366 | | 0.6 |
| Diabetes | 3,300 | | 1.5 |
| Epilepsy | 4,434 | | 2.1 |
| Heart Disease | 5,417 | | 2.5 |
| All Other Circulatory Conditions | 2,066 | | 1.0 |
| Respiratory Systems Conditions | 1,405 | | 0.7 |
| Digestive System Conditions | 7,151 | | 3.3 |
| Genitourinary Conditions | 5,121 | | 2.4 |
| Speech Impairments | 1,524 | | 0.7 |
| All Other Disabling Conditions | 11,015 | | 5.1 |
| Total Reported 2/ | 214,871 | | 100.0 |

Although past benefit/cost analyses have varied in scope and methods, all have shown that the rehabilitation program is cost-beneficial. However, the Department has funded a new study to determine which cost and benefit assumptions produce the most accurate benefit/cost ratios (See III. 2.).

During FY 1984 one evaluation study was completed, entitled "Evaluation of the Delivery of Services to Select Disabled People by the Vocational Rehabilitation Service System." (See E. 3.) The study found that the race/ethnicity of clients made no significant difference in the services received and the outcomes attained.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The program's 1984 goals and objectives will be pursued in 1985. Further improvement will depend on the outcomes of five planned studies (see III).

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Rehabilitation Services Administration, "Caseload Statistics, State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies, Fiscal Year 1983, Information Memorandum, RSA-IM-84-17," March 1, 1984.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses (Continued)

2. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Rehabilitation Services Administration, "Characteristics of Persons Rehabilitated in Fiscal Year 1981. Information Memorandum, RSA-IM-84-08," November 9, 1983.

3. Lawrence Johnson and Associates, Inc. "Evaluation of the Delivery of Services to Select Disabled People by the Vocational Rehabilitation Service System," Washington, DC 20016. May 21, 1984.

F. Other Supporting Data (See E. 2.)

Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity of Persons Rehabilitated by State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies: FY 1982

| Characteristics | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Age at Referral | | |
| Number Reporting Age | 215,020 | 100.0 |
| Under 18 Years | 21,145 | 9.8 |
| 18-19 Years | 21,009 | 9.8 |
| 20-24 Years | 36,297 | 16.9 |
| 25-34 Years | 56,119 | 26.1 |
| 35-44 Years | 34,958 | 16.3 |
| 45-54 Years | 25,196 | 11.7 |
| 55-64 Years | 14,230 | 6.6 |
| 65 Years and Over | 6,066 | 2.8 |
| Sex | | |
| Number Reporting Sex | 211,692 | 100.0 |
| Male | 114,029 | 53.9 |
| Female | 97,663 | 46.1 |
| Race | | |
| Number Reporting Race | 214,869 | 100.0 |
| White | 172,521 | 80.3 |
| Black | 38,423 | 17.9 |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 1,178 | 0.5 |
| Asian and Pacific Islander | 2,747 | 1.3 |
| Hispanic Origin | | |
| Number Reporting Ethnicity | 215,164 | 100.0 |
| Persons of Hispanic Origin | 15,644 | 7.3 |
| Persons Not of Hispanic Origin | 199,520 | 92.7 |
| Total Rehabilitations 2/ | 226,924 | |

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

The following five studies are currently planned or in progress:

1. The "Evaluation of American Navajo Indian Rehabilitation Program" will compare the effectiveness of services for Navajos provided under this program with the effectiveness of services for other Indians provided by State vocational rehabilitation agencies. This study will start in FY 1985.

2. The "Analysis of Benefits and Costs in Rehabilitation" is a study to assess alternative methods of calculating benefit/cost ratios for the Rehabilitation Services Program (to be completed by September 30, 1985).

3. The "Analysis of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agency Caseload and Placement Patterns and Trends" is a study to assess trends in caseload activity and effectiveness of different placement practices (to be completed in FY 1987).

4. The "Analysis of State Funding for Rehabilitation Services" is a study of the financial performance of States under the Federal matching requirement (to be completed in FY 1985).

5. A study to develop Federal training grant allocation policy, based on estimated professional rehabilitation personnel shortages, will be completed in FY 1985.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Mark Shoob, (202) 732-1402
Program Studies: Garrett Coleman, (202) 245-8877

Notes:

1. Although under a separate authorization, amounts for Federal maintenance of effort are included here.

2. The total reported in the table in section II. C. represents the total number of rehabilitations where the type of disability was reported. The total number of persons rehabilitated was 226,924 as reported in the table at section II. F.

# CLIENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (CAP)
(CFDA No. 84.161)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title I, Part A, Section 112, (29 U.S.C. 732) (Expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1980: 1/

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $3,500,000 | $3,500,000 |
| 1981 | 3,500,000 | 2,800,000 |
| 1982 | 3,500,000 | 942,000 |
| 1983 | 3,500,000 | 1,734,000 |
| 1984 | 6,000,000 | 6,000,000 |

Purpose: To inform and advise clients of all available benefits under the Rehabilitation Act and related Federal and State assistance programs; to assist clients in their relationships with projects, programs, and facilities providing rehabilitation services; to help clients pursue legal, administrative, and other available remedies when necessary to ensure the protection of their rights; and to advise State and other agencies of problem areas in the delivery of rehabilitation services and suggest methods of improving agency performance.

Applicant Eligibility: Grants to States support Client Assistance Programs (CAPs) administered by public or private agencies designated by Governors. Such agencies must be independent of any agency which provides services to individuals under the Act unless an agency to be designated had, prior to the Rehabilitation Amendments of 1984, served as a client assistance agency under Section 112 and received Federal financial assistance under the Act.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives were:

- To implement this new mandatory program through the development of program regulations and a grant reporting system.
- To process and award grants so that a Client Assistance Program would be in effect in every State by October 1, 1984.
- To develop a Request for Proposals and make a contract for an evaluation of the program.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

- ED published proposed regulations on May 17, 1984 and sent to OMB a proposed program reporting system.
- The Department awarded grants totalling $6 million to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the 6 territories.
- ED signed a contract for program evaluation in September 1984.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

No studies of the programs's effectiveness have been carried out.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration has proposed to discontinue Federal funding of this program but retain the requirement that CAPs be in effect as a condition of basic State rehabilitation services grant funding.

## E., F.

No new information.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

An evaluation study of this program, as required by statute, began in late September, 1984.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frederick Sachs, (202) 732-1396

Program Studies: Barbara Coates, (202) 245-8281

### Note

1/ The Rehabilitation Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-221, changed the basis of the Client Assistance Program from a discretionary project basis to a mandatory formula grant. Funding figures prior to FY 1984 pertain to competitive project grants.

# DISCRETIONARY PROJECT GRANTS FOR TRAINING REHABILITATION PERSONNEL
(CFDA No. 84.129)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title I, Part C, Section 304(a), (20 U.S.C. 774). (Expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $40,000,000 | $28,500,000 |
| 1981 | 45,000,000 | 21,675,000 |
| 1982 | 25,500,000 | 19,200,000 |
| 1983 | 25,500,000 | 19,200,000 |
| 1984 | 22,000,000 | 22,000,000 |

Purpose: To support projects to increase the numbers and improve the skills of personnel trained in providing vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped people.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

- To improve the skill level and increase the numbers of rehabilitation personnel trained in manpower shortage areas.
- To support the training of rehabilitation workers in job development and placement skills.
- To improve, through training and communication of standards, the management of rehabilitation programs.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Focused State agency efforts on training rehabilitation workers in areas of manpower shortage.
- Facilitated the emergence of new rehabilitation professionals who trained the handicapped to live independently, to develop job skills, and to seek employment.

- o Developed program evaluation techniques, a case review system, and a clearinghouse for the management of all training projects and approaches.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Trainees Served: 13,580 trainees were served under 345 project grants in FY 1984. Analysis of costs by type of training (see E. below) is shown below:

| Number of Trainees | Type of Training | Total Grant Amounts | Average Federal Cost Per Trainee |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3,175 | Long-term | $16,380,000 | $5,128 |
| 1,925 | Continuing | 2,240,000 | 1,106 |
| 8,400 | Inservice | 2,800,000 | 333 |
| 80 | Experimental | 580,000 | 7,250 |

Program Scope: Program serves all skills and professions relating to vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped.

Types of Benefits Provided: This program is used for a wide variety of training including long-term training in all professional rehabilitation fields; short-term training, such as workshops, seminars, institutes, etc.; in-service training and continuing education; and experimental or innovative training projects.

Program Effectiveness: Third-party validation of overall program was not completed. A contract in 1984 was initiated to both evaluate the effectiveness of the training program and to provide manpower needs data in order to allocate training funds on the basis of objective information on shortages and needs. Each training project has a self-or third-party evaluation component.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Department will continue to allocate funds to manpower shortage areas. In order to meet the legislative mandate to allocate training funds on the basis of documented manpower needs, a contract was awarded in FY 1984 to help provide these data.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

Analysis of Grantee Applications, Rehabilitation Services Administration, 1983.

### F. Other Supporting Data

None

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

As mentioned above, a contract is currently in progress to study the effectiveness of the program and to provide a basis for allocations based on documented skills deficiencies and manpower needs.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Martin Spickler, (202) 732-1325

Program Studies: Barbara Coates, (202) 245-8281

# GRANTS FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF SEVERELY HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS (CFDA No. 84.128)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title I, Part C, Section 311(a)(1), (29 U.S.C. 777a). (Expires September 30, 1986.)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | Indefinite | \$9,568,000[1] |
| 1981 | Indefinite | 9,765,000 |
| 1982 | \$12,210,000[2] | 8,846,000 |
| 1983 | 12,210,000[2] | 9,259,000 |
| 1984 | 12,900,000[2] | 6,235,000[3] |

Purpose: To support demonstration projects that develop innovative methods and comprehensive service programs to help severely handicapped persons achieve satisfactory vocational adjustments.

Eligibility: Public or private non-profit agencies and organizations are eligible to compete for grant awards.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

For Fiscal Year 1984, the Department's principal objective was to fund new demonstration projects to emphasize technology, community-based vocational programs that coordinate efforts across various agencies, and effective strategies for the transition from school or institution to work.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Of the 22 new projects funded, six use computers for rehabilitation and training; five coordinate community-based vocational programs for severely disabled persons; six assist persons in the transition from school or institution to work; and five provide prevocational, micrographics, and life skills training, or pre-, post-, and transitional-employment support services.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Costs and Individuals Served: The 22 new FY 1984 projects will serve 811 clients at an average cost of \$3,234 per client.

Program Scope: Forty-eight new and continuing demonstration projects address vocational rehabilitation needs of persons with the following disabilities: cerebral palsy, mental retardation, mental illness, spinal

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

cord injury, arthrogryposis, muscular dystrophy, blindness and other visual impairments, deafness and other hearing impairments, head trauma, learning disabilities, and multiple severe disabilities. Projects also coordinate existing services to more effectively reach target groups, and conduct outreach and support activities for those who are not yet receiving rehabilitation services.

Impact on State Practices: According to program office data, successful project methods and techniques are frequently incorporated into State vocational rehabilitation agency programs, sustained with non-Federal dollars, and used in part or whole throughout a State. For example, one State rehabilitation agency improved services for low-functioning, multiply-handicapped deaf and severely hearing-impaired persons. It did this by enlisting the help of existing community service agencies that were not previously involved.

Reported Treatment Gains: According to program data, a substantial number of severely disabled persons, in all categories, have benefited from vocational rehabilitation and placement services demonstrated by funded projects.

Direct Cost Benefits: Program staff report that many grants awarded under this program have resulted in cost benefits. One example of a cost benefit is a State rehabilitation agency that uses a mobile evaluation unit to serve clients residing in remote, rural areas where traditional vocational testing services are unavailable. The unit, equipped with a wheelchair lift, has computerized vocational evaluation and career guidance information systems. Through the use of the mobile unit, services were provided to 60 clients in the first year. The cost of the services was far less than that required to transport clients (sometimes with a personal care attendant) to urban areas where such services are available.

## D., E., F.

No new information.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

## Contacts for Further Information

Program operations and studies: Robert E. Jones, (202) 732-1345
Program studies: Ann Weinheimer, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. $12,500 of this amount was reprogrammed to the National Council on the Handicapped.
2. Total authorization for Sections 310, 311, 312, 314, and 315 combined.
3. Does not include $5 million for the Spinal Cord Injury Program transferred to the National Institute of Handicapped Research.

# SPECIAL PROJECTS FOR INITIATING RECREATION PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS
## (CFDA No. 84.128)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title I, Part C, Section 316, (29 U.S.C. 701). (Expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1981 | Indefinite | $2,000,000 |
| 1982 | $2,000,000 | 1,884,000 |
| 1983 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| 1984 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 |

Purpose: To establish or initiate programs of recreational activities for handicapped individuals, with special emphasis on expanding services for handicapped clients of State vocational rehabilitation agencies. The recreational activities carried out within these projects are diverse in scope and are intended to contribute to the handicapped person's rehabilitation, mobility and socialization.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)

### A. Goals and Objectives:

- To fund recreation projects that will promote and expand the mobility and socialization of handicapped individuals.
- To promote the development or improvement of physical fitness and leisure time programs for the mentally and physically handicapped.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- Projects address mobility and socialization through indoor and outdoor leisure activities such as sports and arts and crafts.
- Therapeutic and physical-development activities included fitness clinics, swimming and camping.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

In FY 1984 an estimated 16,000 handicapped individuals were served by the 28 projects funded. No information about project effectiveness is available.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

No funds were requested for this program in FY 1985. The Department believes that these services would be more appropriately provided at the local level. However, the Congress has appropriated $2,100,000 for FY 1985.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

None

F. Other Supporting Data:

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (b)

No studies are under way.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program operations: Frank S. Caracciolo, (202) 732-1396

Program Studies: Barbara Coates, (202) 245-8281

# REHABILITATION SERVICES--SPECIAL PROJECTS FOR HANDICAPPED MIGRATORY AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS (CFDA No. 84.128)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 312, P.L. 93-112 as amended, (29 U.S.C. 777b). (Expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | Indefinite | $1,530,000 |
| 1981 | Indefinite | 1,325,000 |
| 1982 | $12,210,000 1/ | 951,000 |
| 1983 | 12,210,000 1/ | 951,000 |
| 1984 | 12,900,000 1/ | 950,000 |

Purpose: To provide vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped migratory or seasonal farmworkers to help them acquire new work skills and thereby become qualified (1) to obtain employment in other areas, or (2) to "settle out" (obtain permanent employment) and leave the migrant stream; or to provide treatment necessary for the client to continue as a migratory or seasonal farmworker.

Eligible Grantees: State rehabilitation agencies or local agencies administering a vocational rehabilitation program under written agreements with State agencies. Funds are awarded on a 90 percent Federal/10 percent State matching basis.

Eligible Beneficiaries: Physically or mentally handicapped migrants, with emphasis on those with the most severe disabilities. Family members may also receive services necessary to the rehabilitation of the handicapped migrant.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During Fiscal Year 1984, the Department's principal objectives for this program were:

- To process applications and award grants for comprehensive vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped migrant workers, and
- To develop formats and methodology for reporting project activities and results.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Awarded grants to 11 projects in 10 States.
- Developed and field tested a form for project reporting.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: Ten State rehabilitation agencies and one Blind Agency are grantees for 11 FY 1984 projects, and they will serve approximately 3,000 eligible migrant workers. The costs of these projects range from $77,000 to $100,000.

Types of Benefits Provided: Services included a heavy emphasis on outreach, specialized bilingual counseling, physical/mental restoration, prevocational adjustment, vocational training, and job placement. Because of the high rate of client mobility and their remote rural employment, agencies cannot always complete the entire rehabilitation process or provide VR services in the traditional manner.

Program Effectiveness: No new information is available.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

Program efforts in the coming year will center on improving data collection activities and developing procedures for reaching unserved eligible migrant workers.

In addition, the program was to sponsor a workshop in January, 1985 on project progress, the exchange of information, and coordination of activities with other programs.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above

1. Annual Evaluation Reports, Fiscal Year 1983. Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, Washington, D.C., 1984.

## F. Other Supporting Data

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

An evaluation study is planned for fiscal year 1985.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank Caracciolo, (202) 732-1340

Program Studies: James English, (202) 245-9401

### Note

1. An overall amount is authorized for Sections 310, 311, 312, 314, and 315. Five percent is for section 312, plus an additional amount to equal a total of $5 million.

# HELEN KELLER NATIONAL CENTER FOR DEAF-BLIND YOUTHS AND ADULTS
(CFDA No. 84.128)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Title II of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended. (29 U.S.C. 1901). (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1980:

| Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | indefinite | $ 2,500,000 |
| 1981 | indefinite | 3,200,000 |
| 1982 | $ 3,500,000 | 3,137,000 |
| 1983 | 3,500,000 | 3,500,000 |
| 1984 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 |

Purpose: To provide comprehensive services for the most severely disabled and disadvantaged deaf-blind youths and adults, train personnel to work with deaf-blind persons, and conduct relevant research.

History and Award Process: The Helen Keller National Center was created by Congress in 1969; specific funding has been authorized by Congress since 1973 on a non-competitive basis. The Center has one primary facility at Sands Point, New York. Deaf-blind individuals are referred from all 50 States through the Center's network of nine regional offices.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984 the Department's principal objectives for this program were:

- To improve rehabilitation services to deaf-blind individuals, and
- To foster research and development activities that improve the social and economic aspects of life for deaf-blind persons.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

During FY 1984, the Center cut the average amount of time necessary for a deaf-blind client to remain in a training program from 18 to 11 months. The National Training Team and the Affiliation Network System were developed to strengthen services to deaf-blind persons at the local level.

B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

- o Research on the deaf-blind and the services available to them was conducted. It indicated substantial gains had been made in their education, but many unmet or inadequately met needs remained. (E.1)

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope: During FY 1984 the Center served 235 trainees at its main facility and provided referrals and counseling to another 949 deaf-blind persons through its regional offices.

Program Effectiveness: No program effectiveness data after 1982 are available on this program.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

Needs assessment of Services to Deaf-Blind individuals, Redex, Inc., Rehabilitation and Education Experts, Inc., December 1982, ED Contract No. 300-81-0426.

## F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Robert Werner (202) 732-1314

Program studies: Eugene Tucker (202) 245-8364

## REHABILITATION SERVICES--PROJECTS WITH INDUSTRY
## (CFDA No. 84.128)

Highlights:

### I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112 as amended, Title I, Part F, Section 621, (29 USC 795g) (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1980:

| Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | Indefinite | $ 5,500,000 |
| 1981 | " | 5,250,000 |
| 1982 | $ 8,000,000 | 7,510,000 |
| 1983 | 8,000,000 | 13,000,000 1/ |
| 1984 | 13,000,000 | 13,000,000 |

Purpose: To (1) provide handicapped individuals with training and experiences in a realistic work setting to prepare them for employment in the competitive market; (2) provide handicapped individuals with supportive services to permit them to continue in the employment for which they have been trained; and (3) expand job opportunities for handicapped individuals by providing placement services, job development and modification, special aids, appliances, or work-site modifications which will permit employment of handicapped individuals.

Eligibility: Any public or private, profit or non-profit agency or organization able to provide training or employment for handicapped individuals, including private corporations, rehabilitation facilities, rehabilitation associations, educational institutions, labor unions, trade associations, State vocational rehabilitation agencies, and social services or other government agencies.

### II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)

### A. Goals and Objectives:

During FY 1984 the Department's principal objective for this program was:

- To provide handicapped individuals with training and on-the-job experience in realistic work settings to prepare them for employment in the competitive market.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- It is estimated that approximately 13,000 placements of handicapped individuals will be made with the FY 1984 funds.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope: In FY 1984, 98 Projects With Industry programs were supported to train and place in employment more than 13,000 handicapped individuals earning in excess of $70 million in wages from private sector employment.

Effectiveness: An assessment of the program completed in April 1983 (E.1) found that (1) PWI projects appear generally successful in meeting the program's goal of developing private sector linkages to assist disabled persons in achieving competitive employment, though quantitative information to verify the performance of specific projects is limited, and (2) no single type of organization is more successful than others in accomplishing PWI goals. Rather, the diversity of organizations operating PWIs and the flexibility of projects in providing services appear to be important factors in the PWI program's overall effectiveness.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation:

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Assessment of the Projects With Industry Program, Advanced Technology, Inc., McLean, Virginia, and Policy Studies Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1983

## F. Other Supporting Data:

None

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

ED began a congressionally mandated evaluation of this program in FY 1984.

Contact for further information:

Program operations: Arthur Cox (202)732-1333

Program studies: Arthur Kirschenbaum (202) 245-8307

Note

1. The $8 million regular appropriation in FY 1983 was supplemented by a one time supplemental appropriation of $5 million under the Jobs Bill.

# CENTERS FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING

(CFDA No. 84.132)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title VII, Part B, Section 711 (P.L. 93-112), as amended by P.L. 98-211 (Expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 150,000,000 1/ | $ 15,000,000 |
| 1981 | 200,000,000 1/ | 18,000,000 |
| 1982 | 19,400,000 2/ | 17,280,000 |
| 1983 | 19,400,000 2/ | 19,400,000 |
| 1984 | 21,000,000 2/ | 19,400,000 |

Purpose: To provide independent living services to severely handicapped individuals to assist them to function more independently in family and community settings or secure and maintain appropriate employment.

Eligibility: The principal eligible applicant is the State vocational rehabilitation agency; however, if a State agency fails to apply for a grant within six months after grants are available, then any local public or private nonprofit agency within the State may apply directly.

The Rehabilitation Amendments of 1984 (P.L. 98-221) mandate that current grantees be funded through September 30, 1986.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were:

- To provide discretionary grants to establish and operate Centers for Independent Living -- facilities offering a combination of rehabilitation services in order that the severely handicapped may live more independently in family or community settings or may be better able to secure and maintain employment.
- To promote substantial involvement of handicapped persons in policy direction and management of established Centers, and to promote employment of handicapped persons in the Centers.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Rehabilitation Amendments of 1984 (P.L. 98-211) mandate that current grantees be funded through September 30, 1986.

o The 74 current grantees are:

42 State vocational rehabilitation agencies
19 local nonprofit organizations
9 State agencies for the blind
4 joint applications by general and blind agencies

o FY 1984, grantees funded the operation of 160 Centers, providing services to more than 30,000 severely disabled individuals.

o More than 40 percent of the staff of the Centers are disabled persons.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness:

Section 711 mandates that national standards be developed and published. Accordingly, a contract of $335,790 was awarded by the Department in FY 1984 to Berkeley Planning Associates for two purposes:

(a) develop the mandated national standards for evaluation;

(b) use the standards as a basis for mandated evaluation of the program.

D., E., F.

No additional information.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

The study cited in II C above is in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Elizabeth Arroyo, (202) 732-1348

Program studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. Authorization for Parts A, B, and C.

2. Authorization for Part B only.

# VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICE PROJECTS FOR HANDICAPPED AMERICAN INDIANS (CFDA 84.128)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title I, Section 130, 311(a), P.L. 98-221 (29 USC 750). (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1983:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1983 | Indefinite | $ 650,000 |
| 1984 | " | 715,000 |

Purpose: To provide vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped American Indians who reside on Federal or State reservations to prepare them for suitable employment.

Application and Award Process: Applications may be made by governing bodies of Indian tribes located on Federal and State reservations. A governing body is required to consult with the designated State unit in the development of an application. Grants are awarded by the Secretary of Education following a review and rating of applications using published criteria. Successful grant applicants are required to contribute at least 10 percent of the project cost.

Duration and Phasing of Activities: Grants are made for one to three years. Funds are made available on a 12-month basis.

## II. Response to GEPA 417 (a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984 the Department's principal objective for this program was to make needed grants to Indian tribes.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

During FY 1984, one grant was made to the Navajo Vocational Rehabilitation Program.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope and Costs: Only one grant has been awarded in this program at a cost to the Government of $715,000.

Program Effectiveness: No program effectiveness data are available.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

None.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

None.

## III. Response to GEPA 417 (b)

None.

Contacts for further information:

Program Operation: Frank S. Caracciolo, (202) 732-1340

Program Studies : Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

# OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

# VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--BASIC GRANTS TO STATES
(CFDA No. 84.048, 84.050, 84.052)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended by Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94-482, 20 U.S.C. 2301 to 2461; 90 Stat. 2168-2213. (Expired September 30, 1984)*

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation 1/ |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $1,180,000,000 | $686,045,732 |
| 1981 | 1,325,000,000 | 612,082,728 |
| 1982 | 2/ | 587,736,648 |
| 1983 | 2/ | 657,902,898 |
| 1984 | 2/ | 666,628,758 |

Purpose: To assist States in providing quality vocational education programs to persons who desire and need education and training for employment.

Eligibility: States become eligible for formula grants by establishing a State Board for Vocational Education, a State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, a State Advisory Council, and certifying a five-year State plan, annual program plans and accountability reports. Governors, or their designated review agencies, may include this program in their intergovernmental review process. All grants are advance-funded.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives of the Department:

- To make full use of findings and recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report on the role of vocational education in national economic development.
- To support the goals defined in response to the Secretary's goal of Strengtening Education and Work. These include:
  1. To add new initiatives to implement the NAS report;
  2. To increase the responsiveness of vocational education to the Nation's defense preparedness;

---

*The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, P.L. 98-524, authorizes vocational education through September 30, 1989.

A. Goals and Objectives: (continued)

3. To introduce entrepreneurship education and training in all vocational and education programs;

4. To increase the ability of vocational and adult education to enhance the training of the workforce through educational technology.

- To submit to Congress the mandated annual report.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- Ten regional seminars were conducted to promote discussion, analysis and implementation of the NAS report. Follow-on activities are planned for FY 1985.

- Three task forces established under goals 2, 3, and 4 are in the process of disseminating and implementing findings.

- The Secretary's Annual Vocational Education Report, FY 1983 was submitted to Congress on June 23, 1984.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Using the most recent data from the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS), the Secretary's report to Congress includes aggregate course enrollments for various categories. Although the VEDS data are of poor quality (for example, there is double counting), the data show:

Enrollment Estimates: Total enrollments in vocational education in 1981-82 were estimated as 16.8 million, including nearly 10.3 million secondary and 6.5 million postsecondary and adult enrollments.

Because of the poor quality of the data for handicapped and disadvantaged student enrollments, no new data were reported for 1981-82.

Types of Services Provided: Basic Grants funds have been used to develop and implement programs in new and emerging occupations or in areas of critical skill shortage. Many States also use Basic Grants funds for replacing outdated materials or equipment and for remodeling facilities (E.4).

States have used their Program Improvement and Supportive Services funds for such activities as developing materials to promote sex equity in vocational education, innovative career counseling programs, in-service training and professional development for instructors and administrators, development of vocational programs in new and emerging occupations and applied research (E.4).

Effectiveness: Evaluation studies equating the value of vocational education in terms of labor market experiences of high school students generally report mixed results. Although relatively few postsecondary studies exist, these show more impressive results, particularly for blacks and certain program areas.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness: (continued)

Matching high school transcripts to the Youth Cohort of the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Market Experiences to use in special analyses is an ongoing effort of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Preliminary reports provide data on the work experiences of high school graduates between the ages of 17 and 21 in May 1980.

The analyses classified students by categories based on the vocational education courses cited on high school transcripts. Only students who had taken no secondary vocational courses were classified as "nonvocational". Students who had completed at least some vocational courses were classified in one of five categories of vocational enrollees depending upon the amount, timing and degree of specialization. "Concentrators" are students who have completed substantial vocational coursework.

Although similar jobs were held by students with few vocational credits and those with none, stronger comparisons can be made by contrasting work experiences of vocational concentrators with work experience of nonvocational students. Among males, twice as many vocational concentrators (33%) as nonvocational graduates (15%) worked in craft occupations. Only half as many vocational concentrators worked in professional, technical, clerical, or service jobs as nonvocational students.

Among females, 61 percent of vocational concentrators work in clerical occupations, compared with 37 percent of nonvocational graduates. Nearly 20 percent of the female nonvocational graduates held professional jobs as compared with only 2 percent of vocational concentrators. Greater percentages of female nonvocational students than vocational concentrators worked in sales and services jobs.

One analysis concluded that vocational concentrators tend to hold jobs for a relatively longer time and tend to work in industries that pay well, but do not tend to work in unionized jobs or enroll in postsecondary institutions as often as others.

The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) examined the role of vocational education in terms of its overall contribution to economic development. In a report titled Education for Tomorrow's Jobs, NAS found that the quality of secondary programs varies widely and they cited comprehensive high school vocational programs as most in need of reform. The report recommends changes in pre-service and in-service training for teachers of vocational education. "Requirements governing the recruitment, certification, promotion, compensation and retention of vocational teachers are so well defined that adaptation to new technologies is costly and slow. Also problematic are rules governing the allocation of resources, the acquisition of equipment and use of facilities," the report states.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness: (continued)

In general, the NAS report was critical of evaluation studies that do not account for differences in program quality. Instead, results are reported for all programs taken together, which may result in modest gains in student outcomes but does not estimate accurately the returns to the better-trained graduates. Employers are also primary beneficiaries of vocational programs, as they can shift some of the costs of training employees to the Government. "Thus, ignoring benefits to employers underestimates the value of vocational programs," the reports states.

However, the NAS panel found too few strong collaborative partnerships between vocational programs and business and industry, a vital ingredient of good vocational programs. Without such efforts, schools cannot respond and adapt to the changing economy, the report declares, and challenges the education community to make substantial reforms, such as strengthening teaching and collaboration with employers, strengthening financing, and improving access to high-quality vocational education programs.

The NIE study (E.2 below) completed in 1981 addresses program effectiveness in some depth. Highlights of its findings include:

Effects of Vocational Education on Participants: Results from research provide only a partial view of economic benefits to individuals and the possible effects of their vocational education experiences on those outcomes. Females who graduate from high school business and office programs have higher earnings, greater likelihood of finding jobs and higher occupational status than female graduates with a secondary general curriculum. Differences in economic outcome between male vocational and general curriculum graduates, who have no postsecondary education, do not indicate advantages for those taking vocational education. High school graduates who pursue postsecondary education below the baccalaureate level do better on a variety of measures of gainful employment than those who do not.

Other evaluations of vocational education programs have been reported in Annual Evaluation Reports for Fiscal Years 1974-1982.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

An Administration bill to consolidate Federal programs assisting vocational education was forwarded to Congress early in FY 1984.

New procedures are being developed to improve the Vocational Education Data System. The Secretary's 1983 annual report to Congress provided details about the problems in this system.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Education for Tomorrow's Jobs. National Academy Press, 1983.

2. The Vocational Education Study. The Final Report. Publication 8. The National Institute of Education, September 1981.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis: (continued)

3. The Federal Role in Vocational Education. National Commission for Employment Policy, September 1981.

4. The Secretary's Annual Vocational Education Report for FY 1983.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

A study to examine the implementation of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Act in selected States is scheduled to begin in FY 1985.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program Operations: LeRoy Cornelson, (202) 472-3440

Program Studies: Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8364

Notes:

1. These amounts include the permanent authorization of $6.7 million apportioned to the States each year under the Smith-Hughes Act. They include basic grants and budget for program improvement and supportive services, under P.L. 94-482.

2. Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorizes $735 million for the Vocational Education Act for 1982-84 but does not break out authorization by program.

# VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
(CFDA No. 84.052)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended by Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 98-482), (20.U.S.C. 2370). (Expired September 30, 1984)*

Funding since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $45,000,000 | $20,000,000 |
| 1981 | 50,000,000 | 14,954,000 |
| 1982 | 1/ | 14,356,000 |
| 1983 | 1/ | 14,356,000 |
| 1984 | 1/ | 14,356,000 |

Purpose: To provide special vocational education programs for persons who have academic or economic handicaps and who require special services, assistance or programs so they may succeed in vocational education programs.

Eligibility: State Boards of Vocational Education are eligible to receive formula grants with the establishment of an overall State Vocational Advisory Council and certification of a five-year State plan, an annual program plan, and an accountability report by the State Board for Vocational Education. All grants are advance funded and do not require matching funds.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

To simplify the grant process, increase State flexibility to plan and administer the program and reduce burden on State agencies.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

No new information.

---

*The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, P.L. 98-524, authorizes vocational education through September 30, 1989.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Effectiveness: More than half the students served by these special programs for the disadvantaged have completed their course and found employment or progressed into additional training and education. An analysis of 15 State Board evaluations receiving greatest amounts of Federal VEA monies revealed little if any difference in the services provided under this authority and those offered under the basic grant. (E.1)

Persons served: In school year 1980-81, the most recent year for which enrollment data are available, an estimated 128,000 disadvantaged aggregated classroom enrollments were reported in vocational education programs. However, data from several States are not available. The special resources for the disadvantaged are intended to provide academically and economically disadvantaged persons with additional services they need to succeed in regular vocational programs. Academically disadvantaged persons include those who have problems reading, writing, or computing, those with limited-English proficiency, and those with other problems. The economically disadvantaged include the unemployed, those on public assistance and residents of correctional or other institutions. (E.1)

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Department transmitted to Congress proposed legislation consolidating existing vocational legislation. Categorical programs such as Special Programs for the Disadvantaged are included in the consolidated authority. This proposal is in response to the criticism that current legislation lacks an overall theme or purpose and tries to do too much. This criticism is most recently found in reports by the NIE Vocational Education Study and the National Commission on Employment Policy. 2/

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. The Secretary's Annual Vocational Education Report to Congress, 1983.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress. The Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) which collects data for this program has been suspended until new procedures, approved by the Office of Management and Budget, can be developed.

Contact for further information

Program operation: LeRoy A. Cornelson, (202)472-3440

Program studies: Dorothy Shuler, (202)245-8364

Notes

1. Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorizes $735,000,000 for the Vocational Education Act for 1982-84 but does not break out authorization by program.

2. The Vocational Education Study: The Final Report. Publication No. 8, The National Institute of Education, September 1981.

## VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--FORMULA GRANTS TO STATES FOR CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION (CFDA No. 84.049)

### I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended by Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976, Subpart 5, P.L. 94-482 (20 U.S.C. 2301-2461, 90 Stat. 2168-2213). (Expired September 30, 1984.)*

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 75,000,000 | $43,497,000 |
| 1981 | 80,000,000 | 30,347,000 |
| 1982 | 735,000,000 1/ | 29,133,000 |
| 1983 | 735,000,000 1/ | 31,633,000 |
| 1984 | 735,000,000 1/ | 31,633,000 |

Purpose: To assist States by providing Federal funds for programs and services in consumer and homemaking education at all levels.

Special Statutory Emphasis: The legislation encourages, but does not prescribe, programs that:

- Encourage men and women to prepare for combining the roles of homemaker and wage earner;
- Develop new curriculum materials that avoid sex stereotyping in consumer and homemaking education;
- Give greater consideration to economic, social, and cultural conditions, especially in economically depressed areas;
- Encourage outreach programs addressed to the special needs of the aged, young children, school-age parents, single parents, handicapped persons, educationally disadvantaged persons, patients, and inmates; and
- Emphasize consumer education, management of resources, promotion of nutritional knowledge and food use, and parenthood education to meet current societal needs.

Eligible Recipients: State vocational education boards are eligible to apply for grants. Eligible recipients for subgrants are local educational agencies and postsecondary institutions.

---

*The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, P.L. 98-524 authorizes vocational education through September 30, 1989.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

For Fiscal Year 1984, the Department's principal objectives were to encourage States to:

- Update, develop, and implement curricula useful to both males and females at all educational levels; and

- Design and make accessible programs to meet the needs of disadvantaged and minority populations.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Program staff report that most States and territories developed and implemented new curricula to teach both males and females the basics of math, science, and reading in consumer and homemaking education programs.

- According to program staff, in 1984, all States offered programs in convenient locations to meet the unique needs of disadvantaged and minority populations. Some school districts used mobile units.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: Based on 1981-82 VEDS data, 3.1 million students were enrolled, with 80.2 percent in secondary programs and 19.8 percent in postsecondary/adult (E.1).

Program Scope: Based on 1981-82 VEDS data, 18.2 percent of persons enrolled in vocational education were in consumer and homemaking education. FY 1984 State grants ranged from $3,787,029 in California to $76,831 in Alaska (E.2).

Services to Economically Depressed Areas: The law mandates that at least one-third of federal funds for consumer and homemaking education be used in economically needy areas. In 1982, 59 percent were so spent (E.3).

Impact of Programs and Services on Participants: The NIE study (E.4) concluded that relatively little rigorous research had been conducted on the effects of consumer and homemaking education on learners in terms of changes in knowledge, attitudes, or behavior. Some evidence from the program office indicates that most former students perceive that what they learned in consumer and homemaking education programs was useful in homemaking and employment (E.5).

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Vocational Education Data System, 1981-82.

2. Vocational Education: Report by the Secretary of Education to the Congress, 1983.

3. State Annual Accountability Reports for Vocational Education. Division of Vocational Education Services, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC.

4. The Vocational Education Study: The Final Report. National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., 1981.

5. Research and Curriculum Projects by State Department of Education, 1983-1984. Vocational Home Economics Education, Division of Vocational Education Services, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC.

## F. Other Supporting Data

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No Federal studies of this program are currently in progress. States and universities are conducting research in cooperation with professional organizations and the private sector.

### Contacts for Further Information:

Program Operations: Bertha G. King, (202) 245-9786
Program Studies: Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

### Note

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorized $735 million for the Vocational Education Act, but did not break out authorization by individual program.

# VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--INDIAN TRIBES AND INDIAN ORGANIZATIONS
## (CFDA No. 84.101)

Highlights:

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended by Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482). Title II, (20 U.S.C. 2303; 90 Stat. 2170). (Expired September 30, 1984)*

Funding since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation 1/ |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $11,800,000 | $5,938,864 |
| 1981 | 13,250,000 | 6,182,654 |
| 1982 | 2/ | 5,936,734 |
| 1983 | 2/ | 6,645,484 |
| 1984 | 2/ | 6,733,624 |

Purpose: To make grants and contracts to eligible Indian tribes and tribal organizations to plan, conduct, and administer programs or portions of programs authorized by and consistent with the Vocational Education Act. Tribes and Indian organizations may apply for grants for any programs, services and activities cited as eligible under Part 1, Subpart 2, Section 120 of the Act.

Eligibility: Indian tribes and tribal organizations which are eligible to contract with the Secretary of the Interior for the administration of programs under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 or under the Act of April 16, 1934 are eligible for funds under this program. An award may not exceed three years. This is a forward-funded program.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goal and Objectives

The program office addresses the following objectives:

1. To improve the job placement record of trainees served under this authority.

2. To promote program linkages to tribal economic development plans.

---

*The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, P.L. 98-524, authorizes vocational education through September 30, 1989.

### B. Accomplishments

Thirty proposals were funded under new priorities announced by the Secretary in June, 1983. The Secretary gave priority to projects which could substiantiate that employers would employ at least 50 percent of trainees for new grantees and 65 percent of trainees for previous grantees. If the tribe plans to employ graduates, similar assurances are required.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Trainees: An estimated 1,800 Indian trainees in 18 States are enrolled in vocational programs in the first year of operation of the 30 new grants. Training is offered in a wide range of occupations including public administration and business management, welding, clerical work, auto mechanics, appliance repairs, heavy-equipment operation, road building, construction, agriculture, carpentry and plumbing, bookkeeping, and computer programming. (E.1)

Costs: Costs vary widely from the smallest grant of $45,429 to the largest grant of $556,099. The enrollment varies from 12 to 300 students. Some programs carry a high per-pupil cost because of the type of equipment needed and the isolation of the location. High-cost programs include computer programming and heavy-equipment operation.

Effectiveness: Data indicate that placement rates for programs designed for immediate trainee placement are about 50 percent. The target population served by these programs has a history of disadvantagement and high unemployment; however, program staff report that placement rates have been slowly increasing (E.2).

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

Increasing job placement continues as the program priority.3/

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above.

1. Project Summary: Program for Indian Tribes and Indian Organizations. June 1984.

2. An Assessment of Vocational Education Programs for Indian Tribes and Organizations. Communications Technology Corporation, November 1980.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contact for further information:

Program operations: Harvey Thiel, (202) 245-2774

Program studies: Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8364

**Notes**

1. P.L. 94-482 authorizes a one percent set-aside of funds from Subparts 2 and 3 (basic grant and program improvement) to support Indian projects and one percent ($68,034) per year from the Smith-Hughes Act permanent authorization.

2. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorizes $735 million for the Vocational Education Act for 1982-84 but does not break out authorization by program.

3. Application for Grants under the Program for Indian Tribes and Indian Organizations.

# VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--PROGRAMS OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE
(CFDA No. 84.051)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended by P.L. 94-482, Title II, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2 (20 U.S.C. 2401). (Expired September 30, 1984.)*

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation 1/ |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $59,000,000 | $10,358,073 |
| 1981 | 66,250,000 | 7,835,073 |
| 1982 | 2/ | 8,536,073 |
| 1983 | 2/ | 8,036,073 |
| 1984 | 2/ | 8,178,000 |

Purpose: To improve vocational education by providing Federal funds for projects for research, development, leadership training, and information dissemination.

Program Components:

- National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE): To assist States and localities in improving their programs, NCRVE engages in applied research, training, product development, and evaluation and operates a clearinghouse for information and products from State and federally supported projects and other sources.
- National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC): To assist students, educators, and occupational planners in anticipating future labor market conditions, NOICC (along with its State Occupational Information Coordination Committees [SOICCs]) assembles and distributes job information.
- Special Projects of National Significance: To assist States in responding to emerging needs in vocational education, Special Projects funds are used to develop curricula and products, which are then distributed to the States by six regional Curriculum Coordination Centers.

Eligibility: Only nonprofit agencies are eligible for the competition held every five years for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Public, nonprofit, and profit-making organizations and individuals are eligible for other projects.

---

*The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Act of 1984, P.L. 98-524 authorizes vocational education through September 30, 1989.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

For Fiscal Year 1984, the Department's principal objectives were to:

- Recompete contracts for two Curriculum Coordination Centers;

- Produce information for planning, policy development, and State evaluations of local programs;

- Develop State and local leaders through conferences and workshops;

- Package and disseminate information; and

- Initiate several special projects to address new national needs.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

During FY 1984, the major accomplishments were:

- Contracts were competed for two Curriculum Coordination Centers and re-awarded to Mississippi State University (Southeastern CCC) and to the Oklahoma State Department of Education (Midwest CCC).

- NCRVE issued reports on:

  - Displaced workers;
  - The effects of alternative learning environments on basic skill acquisition and retention by vocational students;
  - A strategy to teach vocational teachers about new technologies;
  - Defense industrial base training requirements;
  - Transitions between education and work;
  - Anticipating developments likely to influence vocational education;
  - Teacher instructional behaviors related to student engaged time; and
  - Business, industry, and labor involvement in evaluating and planning vocational education programs.

- NCRVE held 92 conferences and workshops in 32 States for 3,760 vocational education leaders. Its Advanced Study Center hosted 2 post-doctoral fellows, and 21 resident scholars participated in the National Academy for Vocational Education. The six Curriculum Coordination Centers provided training and leadership development to the 57 State liaison representatives who in turn held awareness sessions and in-service training workshops for 20,665 people. NOICC trained State officials to teach others how to use the Vocational Preparation and Occupations handbook.

- The following information packaging and dissemination occurred:

  - The NCRVE Clearinghouse added over 500 State products to improve programs to the Resources in Vocational Education data system which now has more than 3500 entries.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

- NOICC made occupational information available through microcomputers in 40 States including more than 11,000 sites; provided information about civilian and military career and training opportunities to individuals in nine States; provided inservice training for counselors in 14 States and territories; trained counselor educators in pilot sites to teach new counselors how to use occupational information; and prepared a guide for the Occupational Outlook Handbook.

o Special projects were initiated on:

- standards for excellence in business education;
- improving collaboration between vocational education and the defense establishment; and
- achieving excellence in education through private sector involvement in vocational instructional program advisory councils.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

In FY 1984, program funds were used to support the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| National Center for Research in Vocational Education | $4,581,815 |
| National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee | 2,243,100 |
| Special Projects of National Significance | 1,050,704 |
| Curriculum Coordination Centers | 773,494 |
| TOTAL | 8,649,113 |

Evaluation of NCRVE Activities: The U.S. General Accounting Office was asked by Congress to review NCRVE's project selection, quality control, accountability for revenues and expenditures, hiring of professional staff, salaries and benefits paid to employees, and outside contracting. GAO found that NCRVE's activities were in accordance with its contract (E.1). Specific findings include:

o Project selection: NCRVE initially identifies projects believed to have national significance based on internal and external sources, including legislative reports, professional associations, and vocational education practitioners. Proposed projects are first reviewed by NCRVE's National Advisory Council and then submitted, as part of NCRVE's annual request for contract renewal, for review and approval by the Department of Education which also designates projects to be done by NCRVE.

o Quality Control: NCRVE uses expert panels and outside consultants to review products prior to their release; field reactions are determined by user follow-up studies and publication-reaction cards (sent to product users).

o Accountability for Funds: GAO found that Federal funds were expended in accordance with the terms of the contract and were properly recorded.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

- Hiring of Professional Staff: Professional staff are recruited through nation-wide position vacancy announcements. A committee of professional employees reviews applications, and then NCRVE's Executive Director and the committee chairperson select the best qualified candidate.

- Employee Salaries and Benefits: NCRVE staff are paid by Ohio State University at established university pay ranges. However, NCRVE's pay rates for principal investigators are lower than the rate for their professor counterparts, primarily because of the advantages stemming from faculty tenure. NCRVE employees have the same basic benefits and retirement system as university employees.

- Outside Contracting: Between 1978 and 1982, NCRVE let 18 subcontracts to 10 subcontractors for $737,969, or about 3 percent of NCRVE's project funds during this period. NCRVE also used 2,492 consultants at a cost of $457,690, or about $184 per consultant. ED approves in advance all of NCRVE's subcontracts.

Benefits from The Curriculum Coordination Centers: It is estimated that if all the CCC-disseminated curriculum materials adopted during FY 1983 had been separately developed at each of the local sites, nearly $6 million in costs would have been incurred (E.2).

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Review of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (GAO/HRD-84-78), August 16, 1984.

2. Curriculum Coordination Center Impact Report for 1983, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Department of Education, Washington, D.C. June 1984.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

A study to examine the operations and management of the Curriculum Coordination Centers is in progress. Results will be used to guide future planning and budgetary decisions.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Howard Hjelm, (202) 245-2278
Program Studies: Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Funds are appropriated for this activity on a "one-year" basis. They become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which appropriated and remain available until expended. In addition, $358,073 (which remains available for only one year) is apportioned to this activity annually from the Smith-Hughes Act permanent appropriation.

2. Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorized $735 million for the Vocational Education Act of 1982-84, but does not break out authorization by program.

# ADULT EDUCATION-- STATE-ADMINISTERED PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.002)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Adult Education Act, P.L. 91-230, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1201). (Expired September 30, 1984)*

Funding Since 1980:

| Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $230,000,000 | $100,000,000 1/ |
| 1981 | 250,000,000 | 100,000,000 |
| 1982 | 100,000,000 | 86,400,000 |
| 1983 | 100,000,000 | 95,000,000 |
| 1984 | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 |

Purpose: To expand educational opportunities for adults and to encourage the establishment of programs of adult education that will enable educationally disadvantaged adults to acquire basic skills necessary to function in society, to complete secondary school, and to profit from employment-related training.

Eligibility and Formula: States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are allotted funds based on the proportion of their adult population who lack a secondary school certificate and are not required to be in such schools, plus $150,000. Insular areas are allotted one percent or less of the appropriated funds. The States and insular areas distribute funds to local educational agencies (LEAs) or other non-profit organizations based on State-run competitions.

Services Provided by Recipient Agencies: LEAs or other agencies funded by the State provide basic skills or other services to persons 16 years of age or older who are not high school graduates and who need additional skills. Each State is required to match at a rate of 10 cents for every 90 cents of Federal money received. (No match is required of Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.) Each State must use at least ten percent of its grant for special projects and teacher training. State grants also support programs for adults of limited English proficiency and for residents of urban areas with high unemployment rates and rural areas.

Annual financial and performance reports and the maintenance of records for audits are required of each grant recipient.

---

*The Adult Education Act, P.L. 98-511, authorizes the Adult Education State-Administered Program through September 30, 1987.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984 the Department's principal objectives for this program were:

- To improve and expand the outreach capacity of the program;
- To disseminate information on effective practices;
- To improve service delivery to program participants;
- To study ways of reducing adult illiteracy.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- State educational agencies are using a broad array of agencies to improve and expand the outreach capacity of the program. Fiscal year 1981 reports from the States indicated an average of 635 agencies, organizations, and institutions per State were used to provide adult education and support services. Business and industry led as providers of services, followed by churches, LEAs, and voluntary agencies. Support services include transportation for participants and child care, with churches being the most common provider of these two services.

- The Clearinghouse on Adult Education has as one of its main functions the dissemination of information on effective practices. Six adult education projects have been approved by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel through 1984 for their replicability and positive impact on participants.

  Networks have been established in support of competency-based adult education, adult secondary education, English as a second language, education for adults with disabilities, and defense-related adult education.

- The delivery of adult education services has changed through the provision of support services, flexible scheduling, convenient locations for classes, and use of instructional materials and methodologies more appropriate to adult education.

- A small-scale study has been started: (a) to identify educational needs of adults, (b) to obtain baseline data in response to the Secretary's adult literacy initiative, and (c) to assess the service delivery system of the program to meet specific target populations.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: The distribution of the fiscal year 1983 monies for use in fiscal year 1984 was as follows: (1) Outlying Areas received $950,000; (2) each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico received a minimum amount of $150,000; and (3) the remainder was distributed on the basis of the number of persons 16 and over with less than a high school education, based on the 1980 Census. Thirty-two States had grants of more than $1 million, with the four largest grants going to California ($7,701,939), New York ($6,802,303), Texas ($5,901,267), and Pennsylvania ($4,740,345). The smallest State grant was to Alaska for $240,095.

In FY 1981, more than 2 million adults participated in the program, about one-fourth of whom received instruction in English as a second language.

States continued efforts to improve the quality of instructional services through special experimental demonstration projects and teacher training projects. Projects trained administrators, supervisors, teachers, and paraprofessionals. Major program areas for special projects included English as a second language, adult performance level/life skills, employability, adults with disabilities, technology, and tutoring.

Type of Benefits Provided: The majority of Federal funds were spent on various types of instructional activities through grants made by the States to local projects. All States are required to emphasize adult basic education programs. Instruction in English as a second language is also a priority of the legislation.

Program Effectiveness: Federal program staff summarized State performance reports and found that:

- Approximately 80 percent of the participants are between 16 and 44 years old.

- Those benefiting from adult education, support services, and associated personnel development efforts included such groups as adults with limited English proficiency, adults in urban areas with high rates of unemployment, and rural areas; immigrant adults; and personnel such as administrators, supervisors, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

- No information is available on the effectiveness of the services.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above

The source of information presented in Section C is the annual State reports.

## F. Other Supporting Data:

Collection of demographic data from the States has not been permitted since 1981. Reports submitted voluntarily by States for the 1982-83 school year provide the following information:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Total number of participants | | 2,573,231 |
| American Indian & Native Alaskans | 26,482 | |
| Asian and Pacific Islanders | 371,402 | |
| Blacks | 493,282 | |
| Hispanics | 608,992 | |
| Whites | 1,029,527 | |
| Others | 43,546 | |
| Participants By Level | | |
| Level I participants (grades 0-8 and ESL) | 1,637,689 | |
| Level II participants (grades 9-12) | 620,827 | |
| Undetermined | 314,715 | |
| Participants By Age | | |
| Age 16-44 years | 2,054,279 | |
| 45 and over | 504,969 | |
| undetermined | 13,983 | |

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 407 (b)

A small-scale study was underway with completion expected in January 1985.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program operations: Paul V. Delker (202) 245-9793

Program studies: Eugene Tucker (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. In fiscal year 1980, a supplemental appropriation contained $5 million for two discretionary programs: (a) Adult Immigrants; and (b) Adult Indochina Refugees. An additional $17.6 million was made available for adult education for Cuban and Haitian entrants. These programs were operated during academic year 1981-82. The $100 million figure does not include these supplements.

# OFFICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

# PELL (BASIC EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY) GRANT PROGRAM
## (CFDA No. 84.063)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Section 411, P.L. 92-318 as amended, (86 Stat., 247-251). (Expires September 30, 1985).

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | Indefinite | $2,157,000,000[1] |
| 1981 | " | 2,604,000,000[2] |
| 1982 | $2,600,000,000 | 2,419,040,000 |
| 1983 | 2,800,000,000 | 2,419,040,000 |
| 1984 | 3,000,000,000 | 2,800,000,000 |

Purpose: To assist qualified students to help meet their costs of undergraduate education at eligible institutions of higher education. The program is intended to improve access to postsecondary education for students demonstrating financial need.

Eligibility: Eligibility for Pell Grants is limited to undergraduate students enrolled in an accredited institution and program of postsecondary education who are maintaining "satisfactory progress" and attend on at least a half-time basis. Students must demonstrate financial need as determined by the schedule of expected family contribution published annually by the Secretary of Education in the Federal Register. Students with an expected family contribution exceeding $1,600 (1983-84 academic year) under this schedule did not demonstrate need and were ineligible for Pell grants. In academic year 1983-84, the maximum Pell award was $1,800 and the minimum was $200.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

The goal of the Pell Grant program is to provide access to higher education to persons who may otherwise be denied access because of financial need. During FY 1984 the objectives were to:

- o Establish a standard of need analysis and distribute this information to institutions and students.
- o Employ an application system which does not unduly burden applicants with complex forms and unnecessary delays.
- o Monitor and control inaccurate or inappropriate information leading to disbursement of awards above or below the appropriate amount.
- o Maintain equitable distribution of aid and maintain access to higher education for students in low-income families.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

Addressing the goals and objectives of this program, the Office of Student Financial Assistance (OSFA) has accomplished the following during Fiscal Year 1984:

- The Department established and published new regulations governing the analysis of need and the calculation of expected family contribution.
- The Department prepared and distributed Pell application forms keyed to the new regulations so that all relevant information could be provided with a minimum of difficulty. The Department conducted studies of errors on applications and developed a set of edit checks to identify items not likely to lead to inaccurate calculation of awards. The processing contractor handled applications from approximately 5.5 million students in academic year 1983-84 and produced eligibility reports in an effective and timely manner. This is an increase of 6.5 percent in applications over academic year 1982-83, with financially independent student applications increasing more rapidly than dependent student applications.
- Studies of the application/award procedures were made to determine the feasibility of increased automation in the Pell system, with the goal of reducing costs and processing time.
- Low-income students were able to attend college at enrollment rates more comparable to higher income individuals than in previous years.

## C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Students Participating: Preliminary program data for the academic year 1983-84 showed that total applications were 5,453,557. Valid applications were up 5 percent over academic year 1982-83 and eligible applicants were 3,528,467. Full data on recipients and awards are not yet available but for 1982-83 there were 5,118,553 applicants with 4,685,750 valid applications, and 3,326,984 qualified applicants (did not exceed the limiting family contribution). A total of 2,600,733 students received awards amounting to $2,420,601,000, an average award of $931 (E.1). In academic year 1982-83, undergraduate enrollment was 10.8 million (E.2), so that 24 percent of all undergraduates received a Pell grant.

Institutions Participating: The number of institutions participating in the Pell program continued to increase slightly. Institutions acting as the disbursing agent (regular disbursement system or RDS) were up from 4,981 in academic year 1981-82 to 5,036 in 1982-83, and those requesting OSFA to act as the disbursing agent (alternate disbursement system or ADS) were up from 800 to 812 in this time span (E.3).[3]

Program Effectiveness: Program data do not include the effects of other forms of financial support (except for expected family contribution) and do not contain racial information. Other sources of data must be used to evaluate these factors and one such source is the annual survey of freshmen of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). Although this survey covers only freshmen, it is very large (about 300,000 respondents) and available over a long period of time.

## C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Table 1 shows the most recent four years of data for first-time, full-time dependent freshmen surveyed by the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). The average awards are quite comparable to those obtained from overall program data (in academic year 1981-82 CIRP average = $847, program average = $849; in academic year 1982-83 CIRP average = $887, program average $931). The larger value in program data shows the effect of financially independent students who tend to receive larger Pell grants than dependent students.

Of interest in Table 1 is the decline in the percent of cost, which represents the portion of educational cost covered by the Pell award. In all income categories, this factor has decreased, with the most noticeable changes occurring at the extremes of the income range. Thus, although Pell grants have increased in amount (this agrees with program data for all recipients), costs of education have increased even more.

Table 1 also shows that for the total population of freshmen (last column of table), the decline in the percentage of students receiving Pell grants ended in academic year 1982-83, with a return towards the academic year 1980-81 level. This seems to be consistent with the applicant increase shown by the program data for academic year 1983-84, i.e. more were applying and presumably more were getting aid. The high recipient rate and fraction of cost covered in the lowest income group of Table 1 suggests that the legislative intent, to provide a floor of support for low-income students, is being met.

The percent of freshmen aided in academic year 1982-83 was 24.1 percent which agrees very favorably with the previous estimate of 24 percent of all undergraduates receiving Pell grants.

An interesting fact in the distribution of Pell funds is the marked growth of the share taken by proprietary schools over the same four-year period. Table 2 shows authorization amounts and number of recipients for public, private, and proprietary schools. The increase in the proprietary share is about two-thirds in the period shown.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration stressed the importance of parental and student contributions to meeting college costs before Federal student aid is considered. Currently, a student calculates the amount of Federal aid obtainable (such as grants, low-cost loans and work-study funds) and then looks to parents or self-help for additional funds. Under the Administration's policy, the amount of the family contribution and self-help would be calculated first, before the student qualifies for any grants.

The Department of Education is developing regulations for validating applicant data, based on the results of quality control studies and external reports. It is also pursuing an evaluation of electronic delivery capability to reduce the time to process applications and to improve the accuracy of the procedure. This system would make it much easier to verify Pell awards. Both efforts -- the new regulations and electronic grant awards -- could significantly reduce fraud and abuse in the distribution of Pell grants.

## Table 1

### Participation Patterns of First-Time Full-Time Dependent Students in the Pell Grant Program By Family Income Academic Years 1980-81 to 1983-84

| | | Family Income | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACADEMIC YEAR | | LESS THAN $10,000 | $10,000 THRU $19,999 | $20,000 THRU $29,999 | $30,000 THRU $39,999 | $40,000 OR MORE | TOTAL |
| 1980-81 | AWARD AVG. | $1,029 | $828 | $636 | $690 | $808 | $828 |
| | % AIDED | 67.0 | 50.4 | 27.7 | 12.2 | 5.3 | 32.2 |
| | % OF COST | 26.5 | 20.2 | 15.3 | 16.2 | 17.3 | 19.7 |
| 1981-82 | AWARD AVG. | $1,016 | $848 | $703 | $763 | $864 | $847 |
| | % AIDED | 60.0 | 44.9 | 24.9 | 12.2 | 5.2 | 26.5 |
| | % OF COST | 26.1 | 20.5 | 16.1 | 16.5 | 17.9 | 20.3 |
| 1982-83 | AWARD AVG. | $1,094 | $831 | $727 | $789 | $917 | $887 |
| | % AIDED | 59.7 | 47.1 | 23.6 | 10.9 | 4.9 | 24.1 |
| | % OF COST | 23.4 | 18.3 | 14.8 | 15.5 | 15.8 | 17.3 |
| 1983-84 | AWARD AVG. | $1,148 | $990 | $812 | $848 | $937 | $969 |
| | % AIDED | 66.0 | 51.1 | 27.5 | 13.5 | 6.6 | 27.3 |
| | % OF COST | 22.9 | 19.2 | 15.3 | 15.4 | 14.8 | 19.4 |

KEY: AWARD AVG. = Average Dollars Awarded Per Recipient
% AIDED = Number of Recipients ÷ Total Students
% OF COST = Award average ÷ Average Cost

SOURCE: See E.4 below.

## Table 2

### Pell Distribution by Institutional Control

| | Authorizations (millions of $) | | | | | | Recipients (thousands) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Public | | Private | | Proprietary | | Public | | Private | | Proprietary | |
| | Amt. | % | Amt. | % | Amt. | % | Amt. | % | Amt. | % | Amt. | % |
| 1980-81 | 1425 | 59.7 | 686 | 28.8 | 275 | 11.5 | 1867 | 66.8 | 633 | 22.7 | 295 | 10.5 |
| 1981-82 | 1367 | 59.5 | 622 | 27.1 | 310 | 13.5 | 1810 | 66.0 | 602 | 22.0 | 331 | 12.1 |
| 1982-83 | 1374 | 56.9 | 642 | 26.6 | 400 | 16.7 | 1607 | 63.3 | 552 | 21.7 | 380 | 15.0 |
| 1983-84 | 1583 | 56.5 | 689 | 24.6 | 531 | 19.0 | 1748 | 62.6 | 562 | 20.1 | 483 | 17.3 |

SOURCE: See E.5 below.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, "Pell Grant Program 1982-83 End-of-year Report", compiled by OSFA.
2. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, "Condition of Education", 1984 edition.
3. Program Files, Office of Program Operations, September, 1984.
4. Cooperative Institutional Research Programs of the Higher Education Research Institute - Annual Survey of Freshmen, Academic Years 1980-81, 1981-82, 1982-83.
5. Pell Grant Program, Institutional Agreement and Authorization Reports, March 1985.

## F. Other Supporting Data

Table 3 on the next page shows the distribution of academic year 1983-84 Pell grants to freshmen by race and sex (E.4). The difference in participation rates and mean award rates between men and women is not great. In general, the participation rates were higher for black students than for non-black students, and grant sizes varied across income groups.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

The CIRP survey (E.4) provides annual data on the distribution of aid for Federal student aid programs for first-time, full-time dependent freshmen. Data for the 1984-85 academic year will be available in Spring 1985.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Joseph A. Vignone, (202) 472-4300

Program studies: Robert Bart, (202) 245-7884

### Notes

1. Congress reappropriated excess monies from FY 1979 and rescinded $140 million. ED drew down $258 million from FY 1981 for use in FY 1980. The total amount available for awards was $2,420,146,000.
2. Includes $150 million budget reduction. Includes a $451 million Supplemental appropriation. Of this amount, ED drew down $258 million for FY80. The total amount available for awards was $2,309,856,000.
3. Under the regular disbursement system, ED distributes funds to the school; under the alternate system, schools certify a student's eligibility and ED distributes directly to the student.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Table 3

### Participation in the Pell Program for First-Time, Full-Time Dependent Students Fall 1983 By Sex, Race, and Family Income

|  | Family Income |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PARTICIPATION | LESS THAN $10,000 | $10,000 THRU $19,999 | $20,000 THRU $29,999 | $30,000 THRU $39,999 | $40,000 OR MORE | TOTAL |
| **Men** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| % Participating | 64.7 | 50.4 | 27.4 | 13.8 | 6.9 | 25.9 |
| Average per Recipient | $1,157 | $1,002 | $ 837 | $ 863 | $ 969 | $ 976 |
| **Women** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| % Participating | 67.0 | 51.8 | 27.6 | 13.2 | 6.3 | 28.7 |
| Average per Recipient | $1,142 | $ 978 | $ 785 | $ 830 | $ 896 | $ 962 |
| **Blacks** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| % Participating | 77.6 | 68.8 | 47.4 | 26.6 | 20.6 | 57.8 |
| Average per Recipient | $1,235 | $ 1181 | $ 1102 | $ 1049 | $1143 | $1183 |
| **Non-blacks** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| % Participating | 62.2 | 48.6 | 26.2 | 12.9 | 6.2 | 24.6 |
| Average per Recipient | $1,112 | $ 950 | $ 776 | $ 829 | $ 914 | $ 924 |
| **All Students** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| % Participating | 66.0 | 51.1 | 27.5 | 13.5 | 6.6 | 27.3 |
| Average per Recipient | $1,146 | $ 990 | $ 812 | $ 848 | $ 937 | $ 969 |

SOURCE: See E.4 above.

# SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.007)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2; Public Law 89-329 as amended, (20 U.S.C. 1070b) (Expires September 30, 1985).

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $200,000,000 [1] | $370,000,000 |
| 1981 | 200,000,000 [1] | 370,000,000 |
| 1982 | 370,000,000 [2] | 355,400,000 |
| 1983 | 370,000,000 [2] | 355,400,000 |
| 1984 | 370,000,000 [2] | 375,000,000 |

Purpose: To enable needy undergraduate students to meet educational expenses, which exceed the amount of their Pell grant plus family, institutional and self support. Of the two types of SEOG grants, initial year (iy) grants are for students who did not previously receive an SEOG, while continuing grants (cy) are for students who did receive an SEOG grant before. Funding for initial year grants is allocated separately from continuing year grants, but institutions have the option of transferring funds between the two.

Funding: Appropriated SEOG funds are allocated to States which in turn allocate funds to institutions. The institutions then distribute grants to students, each institution having the option of interchanging up to 10 percent of its funds in the SEOG program with the Work-Study program.

All states are automatically eligible to participate in the SEOG program. ED allocates 90 percent of the funds to them based on each State's full-time-equivalent (FTE) enrollment relative to the total number of students in all States, and the remaining 10 percent under regulations established by the Secretary. However, since 1982, Congress has provided for an allocation based on the 1981 distribution of SEOG funds.

Institutional Eligibility: Institutions of higher education are eligible to apply for participation in the SEOG program. States allocate funds to them based on a "conditional guarantee" plus increases based on the "fair share" of total State and total national apportionments. No institution may receive less than its 1979 allocation.

Student Eligibility: Students in participating institutions of higher education are eligible to receive an SEOG if they are enrolled at least half-time, are maintaining satisfactory progress as determined by the institution, meet citizen/resident requirements, do not owe a refund on a Title IV grant, and are not in default on a Title IV loan. Institutions allocate grants to students on the basis of financial need, subject to the availability of funds. The maximum SEOG grant is $2,000 and the minimum is $200.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984 the Department's principal objectives for this program were to:

- o Encourage institutional participation in the SEOG program to increase the number of students having access to this form of aid.

- o Establish and disseminate standard needs analysis criteria and approve equivalent institutional analysis formulas so that all students would have equal opportunity to participate.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o The SEOG program has had a net increase of approximately 125 participating institutions a year (mostly proprietary) since 1978. In academic year 1983-84, approximately 4,200 institutions will share in the allocation distributed by the Department of Education.

- o The Department published tables of expected family contribution and limits for approved institutional needs analysis systems in the Code of Federal Regulations.

### C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Program Scope: The program staff reported that in academic year 1982-83 635,691 students received grants, a drop from 658,893 in 1981-82. In academic year 1982-83 the average grant award amount was $539, down slightly from $549 in 1981-82 (E.1, E.2). Data on first-time, full-time freshmen participants in SEOG is shown in Table 1, covering the academic years from 1980-81 to 1983-84. Between academic years 1981-82 and 1982-83, participation declined (6.60% to 5.87%) but average awards increased $687 to $772. However, only full-time freshman are shown in Table 1 while program data include all classes and half-time students.

In academic years 1983-84, the SEOG participation rate among first-time, full-time dependent freshmen rose to 7.2 percent. Program data, when available, may show a slight growth in participating students from academic year 1982-83 to 1983-84.

Program Effectiveness: The equitable distribution of SEOG funds can be assessed by determining how it varies with measures of ability to pay. These may be individually oriented, e.g., family income for students, or group oriented, e.g., median income or average need within a State. Ideally, funds distributed should reflect ability to pay and cost of education.

Although originally targeted at only the neediest students, the SEOG program now applies to all students with any demonstrated financial need. Fiscal operations reports from institutions show how grant recipients vary by income level. Although this program report, Table 2, uses different income ranges than Table 1, it shows that both recipients and funds vary fairly uniformly even across the three lowest income categories.

## Table 1

### Participation Patterns of First-Time Full-Time Dependent Students in SEOG By Family Income, Academic Years 1980-81 to 1983-84

| | | Family Income | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACADEMIC YEAR | | LESS THAN $10,000 | $10,000 THRU $19,999 | $20,000 THRU $29,999 | $30,000 THRU $39,999 | $40,000 OR MORE | TOTAL |
| 1980-81 | AWARD AVG. | $699 | $648 | $632 | $667 | $818 | $664 |
| | % AIDED | 19.8 | 14.3 | 6.8 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 8.7 |
| | % OF COST | 18.0 | 15.8 | 15.2 | 15.6 | 17.5 | 15.8 |
| 1981-82 | AWARD AVG. | $730 | $669 | $649 | $714 | $781 | $687 |
| | % AIDED | 15.5 | 11.2 | 6.2 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 6.6 |
| | % OF COST | 17.2 | 14.4 | 13.2 | 13.8 | 15.7 | 14.8 |
| 1982-83 | AWARD AVG. | $768 | $709 | $673 | $729 | $816 | $772 |
| | % AIDED | 15.1 | 11.0 | 5.7 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 5.9 |
| | % OF COST | 16.4 | 14.7 | 13.7 | 14.4 | 14.1 | 14.1 |
| 1983-84 | AWARD AVG. | $793 | $757 | $725 | $780 | $894 | $769 |
| | % AIDED | 17.6 | 13.1 | 7.4 | 3.8 | 1.6 | 7.2 |
| | % OF COST | 15.8 | 14.7 | 13.7 | 14.2 | 14.1 | 13.4 |

KEY: AWARD AVG. = Average Dollars Awarded Per Recipient
% AIDED = Number of Recipients: Total Students
% OF COST = (Award Average: Average Cost)

SOURCE: See E.3. below.

## Table 2

### Distribution of SEOG Recipients and Funds by Family Income 1982-83 Award Year

| | FAMILY INCOME | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participation | Under-$6,000 | $ 6,000-11,999 | $12,000-17,999 | $18,000-23,999 | $24,000-29,999 | $30,000 & up | Independents[a] and at least 1/2 time |
| Percent SEOG Recipients | 12.12 | 13.15 | 13.16 | 11.05 | 8.75 | 8.74 | 32.93 |
| Percent SEOG funds | 10.96 | 12.74 | 13.90 | 12.38 | 9.88 | 10.22 | 29.91 |

[a] Independent students are usually in the lowest income group.

SOURCE: See E.2 below

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Table 3

## Participation in the SEOG Program for First-Time, Full-Time Dependent Students Fall 1983 By Sex, Race, and Family Income

| PARTICIPATION | Family Income<br>LESS THAN $10,000 | $10,000 THRU $19,999 | $20,000 THRU $29,999 | $30,000 THRU $39,000 | $40,000 OR MORE | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Men** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 17.6 | 12.9 | 6.9 | 3.9 | 1.7 | 6.8 |
| Average per Recipient | $ 800 | $ 772 | $ 731 | $ 773 | $ 891 | $ 777 |
| **Women** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 17.7 | 13.2 | 7.9 | 3.7 | 1.5 | 7.6 |
| Average per Recipient | $ 788 | $ 743 | $ 719 | $ 789 | $ 898 | $ 761 |
| **Blacks** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 24.1 | 21.9 | 12.5 | 8.5 | 5.2 | 17.6 |
| Average per Recipient | $ 857 | $ 870 | $ 857 | $ 924 | $ 902 | $ 867 |
| **Non-blacks** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 15.4 | 11.8 | 7.0 | 3.5 | 1.5 | 6.3 |
| Average per Recipient | $ 755 | $ 726 | $ 709 | $ 765 | $ 889 | $ 743 |
| **All Students** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 17.6 | 13.1 | 7.4 | 3.8 | 1.6 | 7.2 |
| Average per Recipient | $ 793 | $ 757 | $ 725 | $ 780 | $ 894 | $ 769 |

SOURCE: See E.3 above.

Program Effectiveness - (Continued)

Although the average grant size has risen, it is not keeping pace with increases in education costs. The fraction of cost covered by SEOG from academic year 1980-81 to 1983-84 is declining across all income groups in Table 1. Also, the SEOG contribution supplies about 20 percent of cost at low cost schools, and 10 percent at high cost schools.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration proposed to terminate the SEOG program as part of a new self-help approach which would also have included an increase in Pell Grants for the neediest students.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. 1982-83 Campus-Based Programs, unpublished tables from Campus-Based Analysis Section, Office of Student Financial Assistance, U.S. Department of Education, Fall 1983.

2. 1982-83 Campus-Based Programs Annual Report, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Student Financial Assistance, Campus-Based Analysis Section, December 1982.

3. Cooperative Institutional Research Program - Annual Survey of Freshmen 1980-81, 1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84. Secondary data analysis by PES, Student and Institutional Aid Division.

## F. Other Supporting Data:

The 1983-84 distribution of SEOG to students of different race and sex is shown in Table 3. Black participation rates are higher, especially at upper income levels, than the non-black rate. Average awards are generally higher also. There is little difference in participation rates and average grant sizes between men and women, however.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

The CIRP survey referred to in E.3 above provides annual data on the distribution of Federal student aid for first-time, full-time dependent freshman students. Data for the 1984-1985 academic year will be available during Spring 1985.

### Contact for Further Information

Program Operations: James Kesler, (202) 245-9720

Program Studies: Robert Bart, (202) 245-7884

### Notes

1. Initial year authorization only, no continuing allocation authorized in FY 1980 and FY 1981.

2. Public Law 92-35, Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981.

# STATE STUDENT INCENTIVE GRANTS
(CFDA No. 84.069)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Section 415A P.L. 92-318 as amended, (20 U.S.C 1070c). (Expires September 30, 1985).

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 50,000,000 1/ | $76,750,000 |
| 1981 | 100,000,000 | 76,750,000 |
| 1982 | 76,800,000 | 73,680,000 |
| 1983 | 76,800,000 | 60,000,000 |
| 1984 | 76,800,000 | 76,000,000 |

Purpose: To help States develop and expand grant assistance to students in attendance at institutions of postsecondary education.

Eligibility: All States are eligible to receive Federal formula grants, which must be matched with at least equal funds from State resources. SSIG agencies encourage each State to develop additional sources of grant assistance to needy students in postsecondary education. States may then overmatch SSIG allotments but grants to students cannot exceed $2,000. In 30 states, Federal SSIG funds are overmatched by at least three to one. In the remaining 22, SSIG plus the State match accounts for 40 percent or more of all State grant assistance.

To be eligible for one of these grants, undergraduate students must be attending public, private non-profit, and (at State option) proprietary schools, must meet citizen/resident requirements, and must have no outstanding Title IV default or refund payment due. At State option, graduate and less-than-half-time students may also be eligible. All nonprofit institutions are eligible to participate, except where excluded by the State constitution or by a State law enacted prior to October 1978.

Administrative Agencies: Under Section 1203 of the Higher Education Act each State designates an agency responsible for these funds. It may be part of the State government, an Education Department or division dealing with higher education, the organization managing other State grant or loan programs, or a designated corporation acting for the State. The agency receives Federal SSIG funds, matches them dollar for dollar with State funds, and distributes them to eligible students in the State student aid program.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

Continuing objectives of this program in FY 1984 were to:

- Deliver student aid dollars to qualified recipients and maintain level of state allotments.
- Encourage States to increase support of needy students.
- Insure the existence of State agencies concerned with the distribution of grant aid to needy students and encourage private sector involvement to provide additional sources of funds.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Federal SSIG allotment has been increased from $60 million in 1983 to $76 million in 1984. With the exception of Puerto Rico, individual 1984 state allotments exceeded the 1983 level.
- Total State grant support, including overmatching of SSIG funds, increased to $1,082,912,832 in 1983-84, of which the SSIG allotment represents 5.6 percent. In 12 states which did not have grant programs before SSIG, state funds now provide more than a 50-50 match of the Federal allotment. All states now participate in SSIG.
- SSIG staff have explored the establishment of Student Assistance Service Centers to improve the delivery of aid to students in small institutions. Cooperative programs with private industries have been developed.[2]

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Student Participation: In program year 1983-84, Federal funds of $60 million matched 50-50 for a total of $120 million were distributed to approximately 240,000 recipients, with awards averaging $500. Over $1 billion in grants were distributed by states in addition to their match of the Federal SSIG. The average award for all State grants to first-time, full-time freshmen in the 1983-84 academic years was $789 and 17 percent of these students received State grants. (E.1)

Program Scope: In the 1982-83 academic year, public 4-year institutions received 43 percent of Federal SSIG funds and accounted for 52 percent of all recipients. Private 4-year institutions received 37 percent of Federal SSIG funds but had only 24 percent of all recipients. Two-year and proprietary institutions accounted for the remaining 20 percent of funds and 24 percent of recipients. Data for the 1983-84 academic year have been delayed by a change in the method of reporting. (E.2)

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Distribution of Aid: SSIG data through the 1982-83 program year indicates that the average SSIG award has been declining steadily since 1979-80. However, the increasing State overmatches to the Federal contribution suggest that total State grant awards may be rising. Data on first-time, full-time freshmen shown in Table 1 verify that average State grant awards increased from $708 (1980-81) to $789 (1983-84). SSIG data also suggest a redistribution of awards to recipients with differing family incomes. From 1980-81 to 1982-83, SSIG recipients below $6,000 increased from 36.24 percent to 40.86 percent of the total, and those with incomes above $15,000 remained fairly stable at 30.9 percent and 30.5 percent. Recipients between $6,000 and $15,000 declined from 32.79 percent to 28.61 percent of the total. Program data also show a shift in the distribution of Federal funds to students with differing incomes. (E.3, E.4)

Table 1 also shows the historical pattern of State grant support for first-time, full-time freshmen. It indicates that grant sizes were increasing more slowly than educational costs through academic year 1982-83, in that the ratio of award to cost (third row of each year entry) declined from academic year 1980-81 to 1982-83. There was a slight increase in the total ratio for academic year 1983-84.

Table 1

Participation Patterns of First-Time
Full-Time Dependent Students in State Grant Programs
By Family Income, Fall 1980 to 1983

| ACADEMIC YEAR | | LESS THAN $10,000 | $10,000 THRU $19,999 | $20,000 THRU $29,999 | $30,000 THRU $39,999 | $40,000 OR MORE | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Family Income | | | | | |
| 1980-81 | AWARD AVG. | 772 | 686 | 671 | 726 | 766 | 708 |
| | % AIDED | 27.7 | 25.3 | 17.2 | 10.1 | 5.5 | 17.4 |
| | % OF COST | 19.9 | 16.7 | 16.2 | 17.0 | 16.4 | 16.8 |
| 1981-82 | AWARD AVG. | 802 | 687 | 690 | 765 | 779 | 726 |
| | % AIDED | 24.6 | 22.9 | 15.9 | 10.2 | 5.7 | 15.1 |
| | % OF COST | 18.5 | 15.0 | 14.7 | 16.0 | 16.3 | 15.8 |
| 1982-83 | AWARD AVG. | 789 | 704 | 678 | 735 | 725 | 718 |
| | % AIDED | 28.2 | 25.2 | 17.7 | 10.7 | 5.9 | 15.6 |
| | % OF COST | 16.8 | 14.6 | 13.8 | 14.5 | 12.5 | 14.0 |
| 1983-84 | AWARD AVG. | 834 | 780 | 736 | 821 | 831 | 789 |
| | % AIDED | 29.2 | 27.3 | 19.3 | 11.9 | 7.2 | 17.0 |
| | % OF COST | 16.6 | 15.1 | 13.9 | 15.0 | 13.1 | 14.1 |

KEY: AWARD AVG. = Average Dollars Awarded Per Recipient
% AIDED = Number of Recipients: Total Students
% OF COST = (Award Average: Average Cost)

SOURCE: See E.1 below

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Department proposes to withdraw funding for this program. Federal funds appear unnecessary as a stimulant to States to provide State-based aid because State expenditures for grant aid have continued to expand even as Federal funding has dropped or remained level in recent years. Also, about half the States considerably overmatch the Federal allotment. The other States have been sustained through a development period and will now be more able to provide both halves of their student assistance outlays.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above

1. Cooperative Institutional Research Programs of the Higher Education Research Institute - Annual Survey of Freshmen 1980-81 through 1983-84, unpublished tables derived by Planning and Evaluation Service of the Department of Education, 1984.

2. State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) Data Summary Reports, SSIG Program files, Division of Policy and Program Development, Office of Student Financial Assistance, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, 1984.

3. Data Trends, Fiscal Years 1978-83 -- State Student Incentive Grant Program, May 1984.

## F. Other Supporting Data

Table 2 portrays the distribution of State grants to freshmen by race, sex, and family income for the fall of 1983. It indicates that women have slightly higher participation rates and lower average awards in all but the highest income group.

Overall black participation in State Grant programs is higher than non-black participation, and the average awards in the two groups are significantly different: $996 for blacks and $767 for non-black students. At the high-income level, black students participate at a greater rate than non-black students while at lower-income levels non-blacks participate at a greater rate than blacks.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

### Table 2

### Participation in State Grants[3]
### for First-Time, Full-Time Dependent Students
### Fall 1983
### By Sex, Race, and Family Income

| PARTICIPATION | Family Income<br>LESS THAN $10,000 | $10,000 THRU $19,999 | $20,000 THRU $29,999 | $30,000 THRU $39,999 | $40,000 OR MORE | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Men** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 29.9 | 27.0 | 18.7 | 11.2 | 7.3 | 16.3 |
| Average per Recipient | $ 837 | $ 786 | $ 743 | $ 851 | $ 835 | $ 798 |
| **Women** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 28.7 | 27.7 | 19.9 | 12.6 | 7.2 | 17.8 |
| Average per Recipient | $ 830 | $ 775 | $ 730 | $ 792 | $ 826 | $ 781 |
| **Blacks** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 23.3 | 23.3 | 17.4 | 13.6 | 11.5 | 19.9 |
| Average per Recipient | $1,014 | $ 914 | $ 993 | $ 1058 | $1284 | $ 996 |
| **Non-Blacks** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 31.3 | 27.9 | 19.4 | 11.8 | 7.1 | 16.8 |
| Average per Recipient | $ 786 | $ 763 | $ 721 | $ 806 | $ 806 | $ 767 |
| **All Students** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 29.2 | 27.3 | 19.3 | 11.9 | 7.2 | 17.0 |
| Average per Recipient | $ 834 | $ 780 | $ 736 | $ 821 | $ 831 | $ 789 |

Source: See E.1 above

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of the SSIG program are in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Lanora G. Smith, (202) 472-4265

Program studies: Robert Bart, (202) 245-7884

### Notes

1. Plus such sums as may be needed for continuation students. Beginning in FY 1981, the statute combined initial and continuation grants under a single authorization.

2. For example, State agencies have developed additional funding sources by establishing cooperative programs with private industry, and they have implemented work-study programs outside institutions.

3. State grants include Federal SSIG allotments plus required State matching and -- in many cases -- an overmatch from State funds.

# GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM
## (CFDA No. 84.032)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV-B, P.L. 89-329 as amended, (20 U.S.C. 1071). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Loan Volume1/ | Obligations2/ | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $4,840,000,000 | $1,597,877,000 | $1,609,344,000 |
| 1981 | 7,824,000,000 | 2,721,115,000 | 2,535,470,000 |
| 1982 | 6,238,000,000 | 3,297,776,000 | 3,073,846,000 |
| 1983 | 6,928,000,000 | 2,942,072,000 | 3,100,500,000 |
| 1984 | 7,926,000,000 | 3,478,000,000 | 2,256,500,000 |

Purpose: The Guaranteed Student Loan Program (GSLP) authorizes low-interest loans to students to help pay students' costs of attending eligible postsecondary institutions, including colleges, universities and vocational, technical, business and trade schools and certain foreign institutions. Its purpose is to facilitate students' access to postsecondary education and to enhance their choices among a broader range of institutions.

Parent Loans for Undergraduate Students (PLUS) and Auxiliary Loans serve the same general purpose as GSLP. PLUS/Auxiliary makes loans to parents of dependent undergraduates, and to graduate and independent undergraduate students. PLUS/Auxiliary loans are less subsidized than regular GSLP loans and repayment begins within 60 days of the loan disbursement.

Eligibility: The GSLP program varies from State to State. Generally, all U.S. citizens, nationals, or permanent residents in the United States for other than a temporary purpose, may apply if they are enrolled or accepted for enrollment on at least a half-time basis as undergraduate, graduate, professional or vocational students at a participating postsecondary school. A student who is presently enrolled at a participating institution must be maintaining satisfactory progress. Also, the student must not owe a refund on any Title IV grant or be in default on any Title IV loans. If the student's or the family's adjusted gross income is $30,000 or more, the student/family must undergo a "need test" to determine eligibility for Federal payment of interest on the student's behalf while the student is in school.

PLUS/Auxiliary: Parents and eligible students are generally can obtain loans on the same basis as those borrowing under regular GSLP provisions. An important exception is that there is no need test on income, although lenders may restrict loans or loan amounts based on the borrower's creditworthiness.

CIS

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal operating objectives for this program were:

- to implement recent legislative amendments which authorized the Secretary to police the amount of tax-exempt obligations issued for student loan purposes.
- to accelerate collections on defaulted loans, especially by private collection agencies under contract with the Secretary.
- to accelerate compliance actions involving fraud, waste, and abuse; and accelerate the prosecution of defaulters through the Justice Department.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- ED implemented all new statutory provisions and reduced tax-exempt bond volume raised for student loan purposes.
- It increased the collection activities of private agencies in FY 1984.
- It resolved all outstanding audits during FY 1984 and sent defaulted accounts meeting certain criteria to the Department of Justice for prosecution.

### C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Student Participation: ED estimates that about 28 percent of all eligible students participate in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. For full-time freshmen undergraduates for the fall of 1983, the participation rate was 23.4 percent. (See Table 2 for more detail.) Participation rates and average loan amounts are sensitive primarily to the cost of education. For the lowest cost category (less than $3,000), the average participation rate in 1983 was 17.5 percent. For the highest cost category (more than $6,000), 44.2 percent of all students borrowed under this program. Although a smaller percentage of students in the lowest-cost schools participated, student loans paid for a larger percentage of their total costs. For example, in FY 1983, loans covered 45.5 percent of total cost in the least expensive category of institution, but paid for only 23.7 percent of total cost in the highest cost category. However, the average loan at the highest cost schools was about 50 percent larger than in the lowest cost schools. Because of the annual borrowing limit, ($2,500) students attending progressively more expensive institutions find that guaranteed loans will meet a smaller percentage of their total costs. (E.1) Data on the PLUS/Auxiliary program are not yet available.

Program Scope: For GSLP: ED estimates that total FY 1984 loan volume amounted to about $7.6 billion, compared with $6.7 billion in FY 1983. In FY 1984, 3.3 million students received loans compared to 2.9 million the year before.

For PLUS/Auxiliary: ED estimates that FY 1984 PLUS/Auxiliary Loans amounted to $369 million, while in FY 1983 this component of the program was $257 million. 141,000 persons participated in the PLUS/Auxiliary program in FY 1984, compared with 100,000 in FY 1983.

For both program components, we estimate that cumulative outstanding loan volume amounted to $33,000 billion in FY 1984 and $27,500 billion in FY 1983.

Table 1 displays these data for 1981-82 to 1983-84.

Table 1

Summary of Loan Volume (in millions)
and Numbers of Recipients (in thousands)
Academic Years 1981-82, 1982-83, and 1983-84

| | 1981-82 | 1982-83 | 1983-84 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Regular Loans | | | |
| Loan volume | $6,135 | $6,671 | $7,557 |
| Recipients | 2,746 | 2,939 | 3,285 |
| Average Loan | $2,234 | $2,269 | $2,360 |
| PLUS/Auxiliary Loans | | | |
| Loan volume | $ 103 | $ 257 | $ 369 |
| Recipients | 42 | 100 | 141 |
| Average Loan | $2,470 | $2,571 | $2,625 |
| Total | | | |
| Loan volume | $6,238 | $6,928 | $7,926 |
| Recipients | 2,788 | 3,039 | 3,426 |
| Average loan | $2,238 | $2,279 | $2,314 |
| Total Cumulative Outstanding Loan Volume | $22,700 | $27,500 | $33,000 |

SOURCE: See E.2 below

Program Effectiveness: During recent years, the Department has applied a need test to loan applicants from families with adjusted gross incomes of $30,000 and above. Table 2 shows that the need test tends to have the effect of lessening the number of applicants eligible for a loan and decreasing the average amount of loan awarded to those who are eligible. Students in the $30,000-$39,999 category actually increased their rate of participation from 24.8 percent in FY 1980 to 25.3 percent in FY 1983. However, the participation rate for borrowers in the $40,000+ income group had reached a peak of 25.6 percent in FY 1981 but fell to 13.0 percent in FY 1983. A comparison of these two income groups shows that the FY 1982 need test did not generally limit borrowing by those in the $30,000-$39,999 category. However, only about one half of students from families in the $40,000+ income bracket were eligible to borrow after imposition of the need test.

Those still able to borrow could not generally borrow as much as before. For example, those in the $30,000-$39,999 income group had borrowed an average of $2,048 in FY 1981 but on average took a loan of only $1,817 in 1983, a decrease of 12.7 percent over the two-year period. Those in the $40,000+ category had an average loan of $2,161 in FY 1981 but only $1,846 in FY 1983, a decrease of 17.1 percent. The effect of the need test, therefore, was to lower participation rates and average loan amounts for those borrowers who were subject to it.

There is currently no need test for borrowers with family incomes of less than $30,000. Data in Table 2 show that participation rates for this group increased rapidly from FY 1980 to FY 1983. For example, of those in the lowest income category (less than $10,000) 13.9 percent borrowed in FY 1980 and 25.4 percent borrowed in FY 1983. Corresponding rates for the $10,000 thru $19,999 category were 20.6 percent and 27.8 percent, respectively; and for the $20,000 thru $29,999 category, 24.8 percent and 29.3 percent.

Guaranteed student loans also covered a smaller percentage of the total cost of education in FY 1983 than in earlier years. For the lowest income students (below $10,000), the average loan amount was about the same percentage of total cost in FY 1983 as in FY 1980. To maintain this loan/cost ratio, however, these students increased their borrowing by about 29 percent over the three-year period. For all other income groups, the percentage of costs covered by guaranteed loans decreased between 3 and 14 percentage points. For all borrowers, guaranteed loans comprised 40.1 percent of total cost in FY 1980 but only 31.7 percent in FY 1983.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Department continued to increase its efforts to collect on outstanding defaults and to reduce the incidence of default in FY 1984. The Department plans to continue in FY 1985:

- o Obtaining statutory amendments relating to debt collection.
- o Expanding collection activities through referral of additional defaulted accounts to private collection agencies.
- o Sharing information on defaulted accounts with consumer credit bureaus.
- o Conducting computer matches to locate defaulters.

## Table 2

## Participation Patterns of First-Time Full-Time Dependent Students of Differing Income Levels in GSL Academic Years 1980-81 to 1983-84

| | | Family Income | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACADEMIC YEAR | | LESS THAN $10,000 | $10,000 THRU $19,999 | $20,000 THRU $29,999 | $30,000 THRU $39,999 | $40,000 OR MORE | TOTAL |
| 1980-81 | AWARD AVG. | $1,268 | $1,491 | $1,698 | $1,830 | $2,023 | $1,689 |
| | % AIDED | 13.9 | 20.6 | 24.8 | 24.8 | 20.0 | 21.5 |
| | % OF COST | 32.6 | 36.3 | 40.9 | 42.9 | 43.2 | 40.1 |
| 1981-82 | AWARD AVG. | $1,557 | $1,719 | $1,927 | $2,048 | $2,161 | $1,930 |
| | % AIDED | 18.5 | 25.4 | 30.4 | 30.7 | 25.6 | 27.0 |
| | % OF COST | 34.9 | 38.1 | 42.8 | 44.5 | 42.4 | 41.5 |
| 1982-83 | AWARD AVG. | $1,636 | $1,704 | $1,833 | $1,782 | $1,830 | $1,771 |
| | % AIDED | 24.0 | 27.6 | 27.6 | 23.5 | 11.8 | 22.4 |
| | % OF COST | 34.9 | 35.4 | 37.4 | 35.1 | 31.6 | 34.5 |
| 1983-84 | AWARD AVG. | $1,631 | $1,740 | $1,841 | $1,817 | $1,846 | $1,791 |
| | % AIDED | 25.4 | 27.8 | 29.3 | 25.3 | 13.0 | 23.4 |
| | % OF COST | 32.5 | 33.7 | 34.8 | 33.0 | 29.1 | 31.7 |

KEY: AWARD AVG. = Average Dollars Awarded Per Recipient
% AIDED = Number of Recipients ÷ Total Students
% OF COST = Award average ÷ Average Cost

SOURCE: See E.1 above.

## Table 3

## Participation in the GSL Program for First-Time, Full-Time Dependent Fall 1983 Students By Sex, Race, and Family Income

| | Family Income | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participation | LESS THAN $10,000 | $10,000 THRU $19,999 | $20,000 THRU $29,999 | $30,000 THRU $39,999 | $40,000 OR MORE | TOTAL |
| **Men** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 26.7 | 28.0 | 28.5 | 24.6 | 13.3 | 23.0 |
| Average Per Recipient | $1,647 | $1,721 | $1,838 | $1,817 | $1,844 | $1,790 |
| **Women** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 24.4 | 27.6 | 30.2 | 26.0 | 12.7 | 23.7 |
| Average Per Recipient | $1,618 | $1,757 | $1,844 | $1,817 | $1,847 | $1,791 |
| **Black** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 20.3 | 24.5 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 21.0 | 23.2 |
| Average Per Recipient | $1,465 | $1,520 | $1,729 | $1,818 | $1,696 | $1,600 |
| **Non-blacks** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 27.2 | 28.3 | 29.6 | 25.3 | 12.8 | 23.4 |
| Average Per Recipient | $1,672 | $1,768 | $1,847 | $1,817 | $1,853 | $1,807 |
| **All Students** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 25.4 | 27.8 | 29.3 | 25.3 | 13.0 | 23.4 |
| Average Per Recipient | $1,631 | $1,740 | $1,841 | $1,817 | $1,846 | $1,791 |

SOURCE: See E.1 above.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation (Continued)

- Increasing litigation in instances of fraud and abuse involving both lenders and individual defaulters.
- Monitoring the total collections effort more closely.
- Drafting updated and strengthened program regulations.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), University of California at Los Angeles, California, 1983.
2. Program files - Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1980-84.

F. Other Supporting Data

None

## III. Response to GEPA 417(b)

Studies in progress are:

- The CIRP survey referred to in Section II E.1 above provides annual data on distribution of aid from Federal student aid programs for first-time, full-time freshmen. Data for the 1984-85 academic year will be available in Spring of 1985.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: David Bayer, (202) 245-2475

Program studies: Dan Morrissey, (202) 245-8281

Notes

1. All volume figures represent commitments rather than disbursements.
2. Represents total obligations incurred. Amounts have not been adjusted to reflect program receipts (collections on defaulted loans, insurance premiums, etc.)

## DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM
## (CFDA No. 84.038)

### I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part E, Public Law 89-329 as amended, (20 U.S.C. 1087aa-1087ii.) (Expires September 30, 1985).

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $400,000,000 | $300,800,000 |
| 1981 | 400,000,000 | 200,800,000 |
| 1982 | 286,000,000 | 193,360,000 |
| 1983 | 475,000,000 | 193,360,000 |
| 1984 | 180,860,000 | 180,860,000 |

Purpose: To help institutions make low-interest loans to financially needy students to help pay their cost of attending postsecondary education institutions. The Direct Loan program is the loan component of the "campus-based programs," which are directly administered by financial aid officers at postsecondary institutions. Direct Loans provide the financial aid officer flexibility in packaging student aid awards that can best meet individual student needs.

Eligibility: Accredited postsecondary institutions meeting eligibility requirements may participate. ED establishes an institutional revolving fund financed from repayment of previous loans and from annual Federal Capital Contribution appropriated by Congress. ED allocates appropriated funds to the States according to statutory formula, and then allocates them to institutions according to both statutory requirements and program regulations.

If the Direct Loan Program (DL) appropriation exceeds the FY 1981 appropriation of $186 million, the State allotment formula uses the ratio of full-time enrollees in institutions of higher education within the State to the total number of such persons enrolled in all the States. If necessary, ED apportions additional funds to a State to make its amount equal to that for FY 1972.

Students are eligible for a loan if (1) they are enrolled on at least a half-time basis and are making satisfactory academic progress as determined by the institutions or (2) they have been accepted for enrollment for at least half time at an eligible institution, and are United States citizens or are in the U.S. for other than a temporary purpose and intend to become permanent residents. Direct Loan applicants must demonstrate financial need as determined by one of the approved need analysis systems.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives for this program were:

- To collect more defaulted loans not being pursued by the institutions.
- To encourage institutions to collect past loans more effectively and thus make more loan funds available to students.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Institutions turned over to the Department of Education more defaulted loans for collection. Turning over such loans to the Department has resulted in more effective collection of them: In FY 1983, commercial agencies under contract to ED collected $20.0 million in defaulted loans, an increase of 77 percent over the FY 1982 figure of $11.3 million.
- The Department strengthened "due diligence" requirements which colleges must meet in carrying out their collection activities.

### C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

#### Program Scope

In FY 1983, DL volume totaled $595 million: there were approximately 674,000 borrowers. States allotted 49 percent of the FY 1984 Federal Capital Contribution to private colleges and universities although they enroll only about 22 percent of all students. Private universities and four-year institutions received 47 percent ($55.3 million) while private two-year colleges received 2 percent ($2.2 million). Public universities and four-year institutions received 35 percent ($41.1 million) and public 2-year colleges, 2 percent ($3.0 million). Borrowers attending Proprietary schools received about 14 percent of DL capital contribution (see E.1. below).

#### Student Participation

During FY 1983, about 7 percent of all first-time, full-time freshmen participated in the DL program compared to about 10 percent in FY 1980. These rates vary primarily in relation to family income; they are less correlated with educational cost (see Table 1). In FY 1983, for example, participation rates were highest (11.5 percent) for those in the lowest income category (less than $10,000) and lowest (2.5 percent) for those in the highest income group ($40,000 or more). This pattern has been consistent for many years.

The DL participants borrowed an average of $1,158 during the most recent year. The average direct loan appears to be less strongly related to family income and slightly more correlated with educational cost. In FY 1983, for example, participants with family incomes of $30,000 to $39,999 had an average loan of $1,260 whereas those from the lowest income families (less than $10,000) had an average loan of $1027.

## Program Effectiveness

One measure of program effectiveness is the extent to which direct loans meet total college costs during the most recent period compared with previous periods.

Student aid awards have covered a smaller percentage of total cost during recent years, principally because of rapidly rising tuition. During FY 1983, for example, the average direct loan met 19.6 percent of total cost for first-time, full-time freshmen. In FY 1980, the average direct loan met 24.8 percent of cost. Consistent with the pattern of previous years, the direct loan percentage of total cost shows little variation across family income categories. For example, an average direct loan met 20.4 percent of total cost for those from families having incomes of less than $9,999, and comprised 21.2 percent of total cost for those with family incomes of $40,000 or more.

Another measure of effectiveness is the extent to which the State allotment formula results in DL allocations consistent with actual student need. As we reported in last year's annual evaluation report, State allotments are only moderately well-correlated with measures of student need within States.

### Table 1

### Participation Patterns of First-Time Full-Time Dependent Students in the Direct Loan Program by Family Income Academic Years 1980-81 to 1983-84

| | | Family Income | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACADEMIC YEAR | | LESS THAN $10,000 | $10,000 THRU $19,999 | $20,000 THRU $29,999 | $30,000 THRU $39,999 | $40,000 OR MORE | TOTAL |
| 1980-81 | AWARD AVG. | $881 | $948 | $1084 | $1297 | $1600 | $1046 |
| | % AIDED | 12.0 | 13.8 | 11.1 | 6.7 | 3.3 | 9.9 |
| | % OF COST | 20.9 | 23.1 | 26.1 | 30.4 | 34.2 | 24.8 |
| 1981-82 | AWARD AVG. | $922 | $1045 | $1169 | $1367 | $1672 | $1161 |
| | % AIDED | 10.5 | 11.9 | 9.7 | 6.4 | 2.9 | 8.2 |
| | % OF COST | 20.0 | 22.6 | 24.5 | 28.2 | 33.0 | 24.4 |
| 1982-83 | AWARD AVG. | $973 | $1084 | $1166 | $1219 | $1354 | $1138 |
| | % AIDED | 10.0 | 10.7 | 8.4 | 5.4 | 2.0 | 6.7 |
| | % OF COST | 20.8 | 22.5 | 23.8 | 24.0 | 23.4 | 22.2 |
| 1983-84 | AWARD AVG. | $1027 | $1086 | $1179 | $1260 | $1347 | $1150 |
| | % AIDED | 11.5 | 11.3 | 9.2 | 6.4 | 2.5 | 7.4 |
| | % OF COST | 20.4 | 21.0 | 22.3 | 22.8 | 21.2 | 19.6 |

KEY: AWARD AVG. = Average Dollars Awarded Per Recipient
% AIDED = Number of Recipients ÷ Total Students
% OF COST = Award average ÷ Average Cost

SOURCE: See E.1 below.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

### Table 2

### Participation in the Direct Loan Program
### for First-Time, Full-Time Dependent Students
### Fall 1983
### By Sex, Race, and Family Income

| Participation | LESS THAN $10,000 | $10,000 THRU $19,999 | $20,000 THRU $29,999 | $30,000 THRU $39,000 | $40,000 OR MORE | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Men** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 10.2 | 10.2 | 8.4 | 5.7 | 2.5 | 6.6 |
| Average Per Recipient | $1,055 | $1,077 | $1,221 | $1,226 | $1,321 | $1,171 |
| **Women** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 12.5 | 12.4 | 10.0 | 7.1 | 2.6 | 8.3 |
| Average Per Recipient | $1,010 | $1,092 | $1,142 | $1,289 | $1,375 | $1,147 |
| **Black** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 12.3 | 15.3 | 12.2 | 9.9 | 5.8 | 12.2 |
| Average Per Recipient | $1,022 | $1,018 | $1,098 | $1,335 | $1,230 | $1,073 |
| **Non-black** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 11.2 | 10.8 | 9.0 | 6.2 | 2.4 | 7.0 |
| Average Per Recipient | $1,026 | $1,099 | $1,187 | $1,254 | $1,354 | $1,171 |
| **All Students** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 11.5 | 11.3 | 9.2 | 6.4 | 2.5 | 7.4 |
| Average Per Recipient | $1,027 | $1,086 | $1,179 | $1,260 | $1,347 | $1,158 |

SOURCE: See E.1 below.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

Increased efforts will be made to reduce outstanding defaults in the Direct Loan program by strengthening institutional due diligence requirements and by intensifying collection activities. These efforts, if successful, will result in more funds becoming available for new loans.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C:

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

2. The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), University of California at Los Angeles, California, 1984.

3. "A Report on the Funds Distribution Formula Under the Campus-Based Programs". U.S. Department of Education. March 15, 1983.

## F. Other Supporting Data

Tables 1 and 2 show the distribution of Direct Loans to full-time freshmen with different family incomes and costs of education as well as the average loan amount and the percentage of total cost met by these loans. Table 3 provides the distribution to students of different income, race and sex. The data indicates that women as a whole had higher rates of participation although loan amounts were almost the same as men. Blacks, however, generally borrowed at higher rates than whites but for considerably smaller amounts. These comparisons vary somewhat by income but are generally consistent. Data for the 1983-84 academic year will be available in the Spring of 1985.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

Studies in progress are as follows:

- o The CIRP survey referred to in E.2 above indicates annual data on distribution of aid from Federal student aid programs for first-time, full-time freshmen of different race and sex.

## Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Robert Coates, (202) 245-2320

Program studies: Dan Morrissey, (202) 245-8281

## WORK-STUDY PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.033)

### I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part C, Public Law 89-329 as amended (42 U.S.C. 2751-2756b) (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $630,000,000 | $550,000,000 |
| 1981 | 670,000,000 | 550,000,000 |
| 1982 | 720,000,000 | 528,000,000 |
| 1983 | 760,000,000 | 590,000,000 |
| 1984 | 555,000,000 | 555,000,000 |

Purpose: To stimulate and promote part-time employment for postsecondary students who need the earnings to help meet the cost of their education. Federal grants to institutions are used to subsidize up to 80 percent of a student's part-time wages. The remainder is provided by the employer, which may be the institution itself if it is a public, non profit institution.

Authorization for Work-Study programs also provides for Job Location and Development projects intended to foster the location and development of part-time employment. Up to 10 percent of the Work Study grant, not to exceed $25,000, may be used to support these projects.

Eligibility: Any public or non profit institution or organization may participate as employers. Funds are first allotted among the States according to statutory formula and then to institutions under both statutory requirements and program regulations.

Undergraduate, graduate, or professional students (enrolled or accepted for enrollment as regular students) who are maintaining satisfactory progress in accordance with the standards and practices of the institution are eligible to participate in the programs. They must demonstrate financial need as determined by the institution using an approved need analysis system; then cannot owe a refund on a Title IV grant, must not be in default on a Title IV loan, and must meet citizen/resident requirements. The size of the award depends on the rate of pay and number of hours worked. The minimum wage law applies.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department of Education emphasized the following objective with respect to the Work-Study program:

- To promote greater use of Job Location and Development Centers which provide support to institutional administrators in locating and developing part-time off-campus employment for students.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

Approximately 400 institutions had established Job Location and Development projects by the beginning of the 1983-84 school year.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: During FY 1983, approximately $504 million in Federal Work Study funds went to students. This, in conjunction with institutional matching funds, provided $630 million funding for 721,000 students. Private 4-year institutions received 37 percent, while private 2-year institutions received 2 percent. Public 4-year institutions received 43 percent. Public 2-year schools were allocated 16 percent and proprietary institutions were awarded 2 percent.

A recent study of all student employment administered by the institution through the aid office (see E.2 below) indicates that in the fall of 1982, about 13 percent of all educational costs were covered by institutionally administered work programs, a finding that is consistent with data collected from first-time, full-time students on Work-Study participation (see E.3 below).

The study estimates that Work-Study (WS) earnings financed about 19 percent of all costs in public institutions but only 10 percent in privately controlled schools, even though private colleges received a proportionately higher total amount than public institutions. Dollar awards, which averaged between $720 for freshmen and $830 for juniors and seniors, were generally higher in private institutions but by less than $100 in most cases (see E.2 below).

Student Participation

During FY 1984, about 14 percent of all first-time, full-time freshmen participated in the WS program. The corresponding participation rate in FY 1980 had been about 15 percent. Rates vary widely, however, by students' family income. In FY 1984, for example, participation rates were highest (25 percent) for persons in the lowest family income category (less than $10,000) and lowest (5 percent) for those in the highest income group ($40,000+). This pattern has remained consistent for many years. The WS participants received an average of $764 during 1983-84.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

The average amount of WS award is strongly related to family income. In FY 1984, for example, participants with family incomes of $40,000+ received larger awards than those from families with less income. The principal reason for this is that many students from higher income families attend more expensive colleges. Many of these students receive WS awards that are a small percentage of total cost. The dollar amount of the award may be larger, however, due to higher cost of attendance.

Program Effectiveness: Program effectiveness can be measured by the extent to which allotment of funds to States corresponds with actual student need as indicated by standard need analysis systems. Although the State allotment formula is complex, comparison of the average award per full-time student with one measure of student need (the Pell eligibility index) results in a very low (.10) correlation (see E.4 below).

Student aid awards have covered a smaller percentage of total cost during recent years, principally because of rapidly rising tuition. In FY 1984, for example, the average award met 14.4 percent of total cost for first-time, full-time freshmen. In FY 1980, the average award met 16.3 percent of cost. Consistent with the pattern of previous years, the percentage of total cost shows little variation across family income categories. For example, an average award met exactly 14.3 percent of total cost for students with family incomes of less than $10,000 and also for those in the $30,000-$39,000 group.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Legislative Recommendations

The Work-Study Program is considered an essential component of the Administration's package of student financial aid. An increase in funding had been proposed in the president's budget for FY 1985 to assure that more students have adequate work opportunities to provide for their self-help (work/loan) commitment in meeting educational costs.

The program will encourage use of funds to support tutoring for adult literacy and employment at eligible day-care centers. The program will also encourage the relationship between academic programs and Work-Study experiences through the Cooperative Education Program (CFDA No. 84.055).

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., 1984.
2. The American Council on Education, "Student Financial Aid for Full Time Undergraduates" HEP Survey No. 60, Washington, D.C., 1983
3. "The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP)," University of California at Los Angeles, California, 1984.
4. U.S. Department of Education, "A Review of the Distribution Formula for the College Based Programs," unpublished study, 1983, Office of Student Financial Assistance, U.S. Department of Education.

### Table 1

### Participation Patterns of First-Time, Full-Time Dependent Students in the Work Study Program by Family Income Academic Years 1980-81 to 1983-84

| | | Family Income | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACADEMIC YEAR | | LESS THAN $10,000 | $10,000 THRU $19,999 | $20,000 THRU $29,999 | $30,000 THRU $39,999 | $40,000 OR MORE | TOTAL |
| 1980-81 | AWARD AVG. | $662 | $683 | $697 | $703 | $720 | $686 |
| | % AIDED | 23.6 | 21.5 | 15.4 | 9.1 | 3.6 | 15.0 |
| | % OF COST | 17.0 | 16.7 | 16.8 | 16.5 | 15.4 | 16.3 |
| 1981-82 | AWARD AVG. | $684 | $715 | $743 | $760 | $786 | $729 |
| | % AIDED | 20.7 | 18.4 | 14.2 | 9.3 | 3.9 | 12.7 |
| | % OF COST | 16.6 | 15.8 | 15.2 | 14.5 | 14.4 | 15.5 |
| 1982-83 | AWARD AVG. | $685 | $702 | $738 | $753 | $782 | $725 |
| | % AIDED | 21.9 | 19.3 | 14.7 | 10.2 | 4.6 | 12.8 |
| | % OF COST | 14.6 | 14.6 | 15.0 | 14.8 | 13.5 | 14.1 |
| 1983-84 | AWARD AVG. | $720 | $758 | $764 | $790 | $809 | $764 |
| | % AIDED | 25.2 | 22.1 | 16.6 | 11.8 | 5.4 | 14.4 |
| | % OF COST | 14.3 | 14.7 | 14.4 | 14.3 | 12.8 | 13.3 |

KEY:
AWARD AVG. = Average Dollars Per Recipient
% AIDED = # of Recipients/Total Students
% OF COST = (AVG $ Per Recipient/Avg. Cost)

SOURCE: See E.1 above.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Participation in the Work Study Program
for First-Time, Full-Time
Dependent Students Fall 1983
By Sex, Race, and Family Income

| Participation | Family Income<br>LESS THAN $10,000 | $10,000 THRU $19,999 | $20,000 THRU $29,999 | $30,000 THRU $39,999 | $40,000 OR MORE | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Men** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 23.0 | 20.2 | 15.0 | 10.8 | 5.2 | 12.9 |
| Average Per Recipient | $750 | $768 | $780 | $800 | $831 | $782 |
| **Women** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 26.8 | 23.8 | 18.2 | 12.9 | 5.5 | 16.0 |
| Average Per Recipient | $701 | $751 | $749 | $781 | $785 | $749 |
| **Blacks** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 32.2 | 31.5 | 23.8 | 18.9 | 11.3 | 25.8 |
| Average Per Recipient | $685 | $734 | $742 | $860 | $809 | $730 |
| **Non-blacks** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 22.9 | 20.8 | 16.1 | 11.5 | 5.2 | 13.4 |
| Average Per Recipient | $736 | $764 | $766 | $785 | $809 | $769 |
| **All Students** | | | | | | |
| % Participating | 25.2 | 22.1 | 16.6 | 11.8 | 5.4 | 14.4 |
| Average Per Recipient | $720 | $758 | $764 | $790 | $809 | $764 |

SOURCE: See E.1 above.

## F. Other Supporting Data

Table 2 summarizes the distribution of Work-Study recipients by family income, sex, and race. Overall, women have an 18 percent higher participation rate than men, and blacks have a nearly 22 percent higher participation rate than whites. These variations differ, of course, by income categories.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

The CIRP survey referred to in E.2 above provides annual data on distribution of aid from Federal student aid programs for first-time, full-time freshmen. Data for the 1983-84 academic year will be available in the spring of 1985.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Robert Coates, (202) 245-2320

Program studies: Dan Morrissey, (202) 245-8281

# UPWARD BOUND
(CFDA No. 84.047)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Sections 417A and 417C, as amended by P.L. 96-374; (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1a). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization 1/ | Appropriation 1/ | Allocation 1/ |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $200,000,000 | $147,500,000 | $62,500,000 |
| 1981 | 200,000,000 | 156,500,000 | 66,501,000 |
| 1982 | 165,000,000 | 150,240,000 | 63,720,000 |
| 1983 | 170,000,000 | 154,740,000 | 68,366,514 |
| 1984 | 170,000,000 | 164,740,000 | 70,754,376 |

Purpose: To generate among low-income youths and potential first-generation college students the skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school. The goal of the program is to increase the academic performance and motivational levels of eligible enrollees so that they may complete secondary school and successfully pursue postsecondary education programs.

Eligibility: Funds go to institutions of higher education, public and private agencies and organizations, and, in exceptional cases, secondary schools. Low-income individuals and potential first-generation college students who need academic support in order to successfully pursue a program of postsecondary education are eligible for services through funded applicants.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives for this program were:

- Provide technical assistance to prospective applicants for new Upward Bound grant awards by conducting application preparation workshops and developing and disseminating an application development guide.
- Issue 423 non-competing continuation Upward Bound grant awards.
- Respond to GAO's recommendations on assessing Upward Bound projects' success in meeting two important program goals: (1) increasing participants' academic skills; and (2) enabling participants to be successful in postsecondary education.
- Establish grant monitoring procedures to allow the Department to assess changes in project performance over time, to consider requests for grants, and to assess overall program accomplishments.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department received applications for 422 non-competing continuation grants, processed them, and issued grant awards for program year 1984-85.
- In response to GAO's recommendations, the Department ensured that every Upward Bound application funded in FY 1984 contained objectives for measuring the academic skills growth of Upward Bound participants and for following up on Upward Bound graduates to determine their postsecondary success.
- The Department implemented a variety of cost-effective grant monitoring procedures. These included extensive telephone monitoring, reviews of annual performance reports and other data, and on-site cross-program monitoring.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Types of Benefits: ED makes grants to participating institutions to provide educational services to disadvantaged youth. Student benefits typically begin with a six-to-eight week residency and study on a college or secondary school campus. During the academic year, the student may attend Saturday classes or tutorial/counseling sessions or participate in cultural enrichment activities. During the junior and senior years, the student explores postsecondary options.

Program Scope: In FY 1984, 422 non-competing continuation awards were made at an average grant of $167,664; almost 33,000 participants were served at an average Federal cost of $2,170 per participant. Total program awards were $70,754,376.

Program Effectiveness: Longitudinal data from the High School and Beyond survey (HSB) provides the most recent data on the impact of Upward Bound (UB). The HSB study is a nationally representative survey of students who were high school sophomores and seniors in 1980. The study of UB impact used 1982 follow-up data from students who participated in UB during high school and a matched comparison group of students who did not participate. The results obtained generally confirmed the findings of previous UB evaluations: the UB program influenced a significantly higher proportion of disadvantaged youths to apply to college, obtain financial aid, attend college, and persist in college for one year after high school.

During their first three semesters of postsecondary education, Upward Bound students earned significantly more college credits and maintained their aspirations to complete a college degree. However, their retention rates 21 months after high school graduation dropped to about 40 percent; the rates were then no longer significantly greater than the rates for comparable nonparticipants. This finding indicates that longer-term college success for disadvantaged students may require continuing remedial assistance beyond high school. (E.2.)

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration proposed to reduce funding for Upward Bound and to limit funding to non-competitive continuation grants. These grants would be prorated at 60 percent of the fiscal year 1984 award amounts. No new awards would be made. Upward Bound eligibility would be limited to institutions of higher education participating in the Federal student assistance programs, and Upward Bound grantees would be required to share 10 percent of their project costs. The requirement that participants be first generation college students would be deleted.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

2. Reanalysis of High School and Beyond Data to Estimate the Impact of Upward Bound, Steven M. Jung and Applied Systems Institute, Washington, D.C., 1984.

## F. Other Supporting Data

The latest data available indicate that 47 percent of the Upward Bound students were male and 53 percent female; 55 percent were black, about 14 percent of Hispanic origin, 24 percent white, and the rest Asian, Pacific Islander, or Native American.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

The Educational Testing Service and the American College Testing Service are conducting pilot evaluations of 30 Upward Bound projects which are designed to assist projects in the development of procedures to improve project accountability, student assessment, and other goals and objectives that the projects may have.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Carol Smith, (202) 245-2165

Program Studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

### Note

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students: Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, Service Learning Centers (until FY 1982), and the Training Program. Funds are not appropriated separately for the five programs, but are allocated administratively.

# TALENT SEARCH
(CFDA No. 84.044)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Sections 417A and 417B, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1). (Expires September 30, 1985.)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization1/ | Appropriation1/ | Allocation1/ |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $200,000,000 | $147,500,000 | $15,300,000 |
| 1981 | 200,000,000 | 156,500,000 | 17,113,000 |
| 1982 | 165,000,000 | 150,240,000 | 17,057,594 |
| 1983 | 170,000,000 | 154,740,000 | 17,057,594 |
| 1984 | 170,000,000 | 164,740,000 | 17,628,233 |

Purpose: To identify qualified youths with potential for postsecondary education; to encourage them to continue in and graduate from secondary school and enroll in programs of postsecondary education; to publicize the availability of student financial aid; and to increase the number of secondary and postsecondary school dropouts who re-enter an educational program.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education, public and private agencies and organizations and, in exceptional cases, secondary schools. Individuals residing in the target area or attending a target school who have potential for education at the postsecondary level, and who need one or more of the services provided by the project, are eligible for services through funded applicants. Two-thirds of the individuals served must be low-income individuals who are also potential first-generation college students. Project participants must be between 12 and 27 years old (exceptions are allowed). Required low-income criteria for participants are stated in application materials.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

The Department's objectives included:

- Establish grant-monitoring procedures that will better enable the Department to assess individual projects. This will make possible better decisions about requests for grants renewals and more comprehensive assessments of program accomplishments.
- Issue noncompeting continuation grant awards to 167 Talent Search projects during fiscal year 1984.

## A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

- Develop and have approved a new performance reporting form for the Talent Search program.
- Grantees must pursue four goals:
  - enhance participants' motivation to complete secondary school;
  - increase application rates to postsecondary institutions;
  - increase participant's knowledge of educational opportunities and availability of financial aid;
  - increase the number of accurate applications for student financial assistance.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department implemented cost-effective monitoring procedures. These included extensive telephone monitoring, reviews of annual performance reports and other data, and on-site cross-program monitoring.
- The Department issued 167 noncompeting continuation awards.
- The proposed new performance reporting form was not approved by OMB and a revised form is being developed.
- The new project monitoring procedures were used to assess accomplishment of the four goals established for the grantees.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: In FY 1984, the Department made 167 continuation awards for an average award of $105,558. The projects provided services to an estimated 190,800 participants at an average cost per participant of $92. Total program awards were $17,628,233.

Program Effectiveness: Program data for FY 1982 (the latest available) show that 23,285 clients were placed in postsecondary education, with an additional 13,180 accepted but not yet enrolled. About 5,102 actual or potential dropouts were persuaded to return to school or college.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration did not request funds for this program in order to focus limited funding on the higher priority Upward Bound and Special Services for Disadvantaged Students programs. The requirement that participants would be first generation college students would be deleted.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C

- Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

### F. Other Supporting Data

In FY 1982, the latest year for which data are available, 167 projects provided services to 177,750 clients. Of these, about 41 percent were black, 32 percent white, 20 percent Hispanic, and 7 percent other ethnic groups. About 56 percent were women, and 44 percent were men.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Carol J. Smith, (202) 245-2165

Program studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

### Note:

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students. Funds are not appropriated separately for these programs, but are allocated administratively to each program.

# EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY CENTERS
## (CFDA No. 84.066)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Sections 417A and 417E, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1c). (Expires September 30, 1985.)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization[1]/ | Appropriation[1]/ | Allocation[1]/ |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $200,000,000 | $147,500,000 | $7,700,000 |
| 1981 | 200,000,000 | 156,500,000 | 8,000,674 |
| 1982 | 165,000,000 | 150,240,000 | 7,800,000 |
| 1983 | 170,000,000 | 154,740,000 | 7,800,000 |
| 1984 | 170,000,000 | 164,740,000 | 8,101,898 |

Purpose: To provide information on financial and academic assistance available for qualified adults who want postsecondary education, and assist them in applying for admission to institutions of postsecondary education.

Eligibility: Funds go to institutions of higher education, public and private agencies and organizations and, in exceptional cases, secondary schools.

Adults residing in the target area who need one or more of the project services in order to pursue a program of postsecondary education are eligible for services through funded applicants. Two-thirds of the participants must be low-income, first-generation, or potential first-generation, college students. Project participants must be at least 19 years old (exceptions are allowed). Required low-income criteria for participants are stated in application materials.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

The Department's objectives included:

- Establish grant-monitoring procedures that will better enable the Department to assess individual projects. This will make possible better decisions about requests for grant renewals and more comprehensive assessments of program accomplishments.
- Issue non-competing continuation grant awards to 33 EOC projects during Fiscal Year 1984.
- To review existing EOC regulations and policies to determine whether the Department should pursue changes such as a new performance reporting form.

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

- o Grantees must pursue five goals:
  - increase participants' motivation to complete secondary education and enhance graduation rates
  - increase application rates to postsecondary institutions
  - increase participants' knowledge of educational opportunities and financial aid availability
  - increase the number of accurate applications from students for financial assistance
  - enhance participants' motivation to complete studies in a postsecondary institution

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o The Department implemented cost-effective grant monitoring procedures. These included extensive telephone monitoring, reviews of annual performance reports and other data, and on-site cross-program monitoring.
- o The Department made 33 noncompeting continuation awards.
- o A new annual performance report form for use by the EOC Program grantees was developed and submitted to OMB for approval, but it was not approved and a revised form is being prepared.
- o The new project monitoring procedures were used to assess accomplishment of the five goals established for the grantees.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: In Fiscal Year 1984, the Department made 33 continuation awards for an average award of $245,512. The projects provided services to an estimated 104,300 participants at an average cost per participant of $78. Total program awards were $8,101,898.

Types of Benefits Provided: The Centers operate a recruiting effort to identify persons who need the program's services, to counsel them about opportunities for furthering their education, and to help them apply for admission and financial aid. The Centers also provide remedial and tutorial services to students enrolled or accepted for enrollment in postsecondary schools.

Program Effectiveness: Program data for FY 1981, the latest available, show that 33,021 participants were placed in postsecondary schools or other types of training programs, while another 8,078 participants were accepted by a postsecondary institution but had not begun their studies.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration did not request funds for this program so as to focus limited funding on the higher priority Upward Bound and Special Services for Disadvantaged Students programs.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

- Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

## F. Other Supporting Data

In FY 1981, the latest year for which data are available, 32 projects provided services to more than 91,000 clients of which 42 percent were white, and 39 percent black. Women made up almost 59 percent of the participants. (Table 4)

Table 1

Ethnicity and Sex of Participants in the
Educational Opportunity Center Program, FY 1981

| Ethnicity | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| American Indian | 2,178 | 03 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 3,655 | 04 |
| Black | 35,340 | 39 |
| Hispanic | 11,370 | 12 |
| White | 38,687 | 42 |
|  | 91,230 | 100 |
| **Sex** |  |  |
| Men | 37,746 | 41.2 |
| Women | 53,668 | 58.8 |
| TOTAL | 91,414 | 100.0 |

Source: See E. above

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are in progress or planned.

## Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Carol J. Smith, (202) 245-2165

Program studies: Robert H. Berls (202) 245-8281

Note:

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students. Funds are not appropriated separately for these programs, but are allocated administratively to each program.

# SPECIAL SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS
# (CFDA No. 84.042)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Section 417A and 417D, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1b). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization[1] | Appropriation[1] | Allocation[1] |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $200,000,000 | $147,500,000 | $60,000,000 |
| 1981 | 200,000,000 | 156,500,000 | 63,885,326 |
| 1982 | 165,000,000 | 150,240,000 | 60,702,406 |
| 1983 | 170,000,000 | 154,740,000 | 60,555,892 |
| 1984 | 170,000,000 | 164,740,000 | 67,294,974 |

Purpose: To identify low-income, first generation, or physically handicapped college students who are enrolled or accepted for enrollment by participating postsecondary institutions and to provide them with necessary supportive services to pursue programs of postsecondary education successfully.

Eligibility: Funds go to institutions of higher education. At least two-thirds of the institution's project participants must be physically handicapped or low-income individuals who are also first-generation college students. The remaining participants must be either physically handicapped, low-income individuals, or first-generation college students.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were to:

- Issue new grant awards to approximately 640 Special Services projects.
- Establish a variety of cost-effective grant monitoring procedures to allow ED to assess individual project performance over time, to consider requests for new awards, and to assess overall program accomplishments.
- Review existing Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program regulations and policies to determine if changes should be recommended and implemented.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- ED issued a total of 664 grant awards during Fiscal Year 1984.

B. Progress and Accomplishments - (Continued)

- A variety of cost-effective grant monitoring procedures were developed. These included extensive telephone monitoring, reviews of annual performance reports and other data, and on-site cross-program monitoring.

- All project directors were sent an update letter outlining an interpretation of the meaning of "full financial need". It emphasized that Section 646.20 of the regulations requires an assurance from all funded applicants that participants will receive sufficient financial assistance.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Types of Benefits: Institutions of higher education provide remedial or bilingual teaching, guidance, or counseling services to students with an educationally, culturally, or economically deprived background, or with a physical handicap, or limited English-speaking ability.

Program Scope: In FY 1984, ED made 664 awards for an average award of $101,348. Projects served 154,400 participants at an average Federal cost per participant of $436. Total program awards were $67,294,974.

Program Effectiveness: The System Development Corporation conducted an impact evaluation of the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program (SSDS). A follow-up survey, conducted in academic year 1982-83, attempted to determine longer-term program impact.

The follow-up study, which involved students who would normally be in their fourth-year of college, reported the following findings (E.2):

- A fairly high proportion (almost 60 percent) of the freshmen included in the 1979-80 study who responded were still enrolled in postsecondary education three years later, and of those who persisted 86 percent were full-time students.

- While not the only consideration, financial aid was an important factor in determining whether the study participants were still enrolled or had left school.

- Moderate levels of academic support services (tutoring, group instruction, academic counseling) provided in a student's freshman year were associated with longer enrollment, and with greater numbers of course units attempted and completed, compared to the results for the students who received no special services.

- Students who received moderate levels of services appear to have had fewer academic deficiencies to overcome than those who received the full range of services or more intensive services.

- Academic support services received after the freshman year were less successful in improving long-term academic performance. Students who needed post-freshman year services appear to have had the greatest learning deficiencies and the least success in surmounting them.

### C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

- Non-academic special services (student orientation, cultural services, assessment, and referrals) received either during the freshman year or later are associated with longer enrollment, greater numbers of course units attempted and completed, and higher grades.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration proposed to target more funds on aid to the disadvantaged, particularly minorities, and to reduce funding for the Special Programs for the Disadvantaged. The request level for Fiscal Year 1985 would have supported non-competitive continuation grants under SSDS. These grants would be prorated at 60 percent of the fiscal year 1984 award amounts. No new awards will be made under SSDS.

Legislative changes were also proposed which would restructure the Special Programs by requiring institutions to share the costs of projects, reducing administrative burdens, limiting eligibility, and targeting funds to programs that provide direct services to disadvantaged individuals.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.
2. Follow-Up Evaluation of the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program, final report, System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, CA, 1983.

### F. Other Supporting Data

The latest data available, FY 1984, show that 58 percent of the program participants were female and 42 percent were male. About 37 percent of the participants were black, 5 percent Asian, 3 percent Native American, 17 percent Hispanic, and 38 percent white. Approximately 6 percent of the students were physically handicapped. (E.1.)

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of the program are planned or in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Carol J. Smith, (202) 245-2165

Program studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

### Notes

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students. Funds are not appropriated separately for the five programs, but are allocated administratively.

# VETERANS' COST-OF-INSTRUCTION PROGRAM
## (CFDA No. 84.064)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Section 420; as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1070e-1). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | Indefinite | $14,380,000 |
| 1981 | " | 6,019,000 |
| 1982 | $12,000,000 | 4,800,000 |
| 1983 | 12,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| 1984 | 12,000,000 | 3,000,000 |

Purpose: To encourage colleges and universities to serve the special education needs of veterans, especially Vietnam-era and disadvantaged veterans.

Eligibility: Nationally or regionally accredited institutions of higher education. Proprietary (for profit) institutions and schools or departments of divinity are not eligible.

Applicants must demonstrate and document either a 10 percent increase in undergraduate veteran enrollment in the year of application over the preceding academic year, or a veteran enrollment constituting at least 10 percent of total enrollment. Only veterans who are (1) enrolled at least half-time, and (2) recipients of benefits under Chapters 31 and 34 of Title 38, U.S.C. can be considered in the enrollment count.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

- To complete processing of all required reports (budgets, financial status, and program performance reports) and make awards.
- To visit at least one-third of the institutions funded and provide technical assistance as needed.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- ED processed all documents, including applications for academic year 1984-1985 funds and awarded grants to 735 institutions of higher education.
- Program staff participated in cross-program monitoring activities and conducted site visits as scheduled.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: The Veterans' Cost-of-Instruction (VCIP) program was created in 1972. The peak year of veteran enrollment in postsecondary education was 1976, when there were approximately 910,000 enrolled veterans eligible for services. By 1981, the number of eligible veterans had declined to 212,000, and in the years 1982, 1983, and 1984 they leveled at approximately 200,000. Projections indicate that eligible enrollment is likely to fall below 200,000 in 1985. (E.)

Types of Benefits Provided: Institutions receiving VCIP funds must maintain a full-time Office of Veterans' Affairs and provide outreach and recruitment programs, counseling and tutorial services, and special education programs for veterans, with special emphasis on services for physically disabled veterans, incarcerated, and educationally disadvantaged veterans.

The program is intended to provide improved and expanded services to veterans enrolled in institutions of higher education. It operates as an entitlement grant program: An institution is entitled to a payment of $300 for each of its enrolled eligible undergraduate veterans (Category I) and to a bonus payment of $150 for each eligible enrolled veteran who has been the recipient of certain Federal benefits designed to assist the educationally disadvantaged (Category II).

Program Effectiveness: No studies of program effectiveness have been conducted.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

No funds were requested by the Administration for this program due to the sharply declining number of enrolled Vietnam-era veterans, and the capacity of existing institution-wide programs to provide adequate, appropriate services to this smaller number of veterans.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above

Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

## F. Other Supporting Data

None available.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are in progress or planned.

## Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: William J. Craven, Jr. (202) 245-2806

Program Studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-7884

# FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
(CFDA No. 84.116)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title X, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1135 et seq.). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $75,000,000 | $13,500,000 |
| 1981 | 20,000,000 | 13,500,000 |
| 1982 | 13,500,000 | 11,520,000 |
| 1983 | 13,500,000 | 11,710,000 |
| 1984 | 13,500,000 | 11,710,000 |

Purposes: Provide grants to support innovative programs designed to improve access to and the quality of postsecondary education for these purposes:

- Encouraging the reform, innovation, and improvement of postsecondary education and provide educational opportunity for all;
- Creating institutions and programs that offer new paths to career and professional training and new combinations of academic and experiential learning;
- Establishing institutions and programs based on the technology of communications;
- Carrying out changes in internal structure and operations designed to clarify institutional priorities and purposes in postsecondary educational institutions;
- Designing and introducing cost-effective methods of instruction and operation;
- Introducing institutional reforms designed to expand individual opportunities for entering and re-entering institutions and pursuing programs of study tailored to individual needs;
- Introducing reforms in graduate education, in the structure of academic professions, and in the recruitment and retention of faculties;
- Creating new institutions and programs for examining and awarding credentials to individuals, and introduce reforms in current institutional practices related to credentials.

The major strategy of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) is to solicit widely for exemplary, locally developed improvement proposals. It accepts proposals from all forms of organizations and on all topics and strategies applicable to postsecondary education (except basic research). FIPSE grant competitions typically attract 20 to 40 proposals for each available award.

Types of Competitions: Small discretionary grants and contracts are awarded competitively to a variety of postsecondary institutions and agencies (including two-and four-year colleges, State education agencies, community based organizations, and other institutions concerned with education beyond high school). Awards are made for the following programs:

Purpose (Continued)

- Comprehensive Program - More than 95 percent of FIPSE's funds support a variety of action-oriented improvement projects. Projects span the full range of postsecondary issues, including improvement in the quality of education, integration of education and work, initiation of partnerships between schools and businesses, and delivery of appropriate educational services to a variety of learners.

- Mina Shaughnessy Scholars Program - These grants enable educators to analyze important advances in postsecondary education and to make such advances known and available to a broader audience.

- Final Year Dissemination Program - This program supports a small number of dissemination grants for selected FIPSE projects in their final year so that they may disseminate information about their projects to other institutions.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objective for this program was to stress the importance of teacher education and college-school collaborations, applications of technology to education, and reforms in graduate and professional education.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Table 1 below shows six areas which have been growing in size in recent years and now form a major part of the FIPSE portfolio of grants and completed projects (figures refer to new grants in FY 1984).

Table 1

FY 1984 New Grants by Category of Current Issues

| Current Issues | New Grants in FY 1984 |
|---|---|
| Access to Higher Education | 36 |
| Educational Technology | 19 |
| Teacher Education/School-College | 16 |
| Science and Technology | 12 |
| Economic Growth | 15 |
| Reasoning Skills | 11 |

Source: See E. below

NOTE: These areas have been singled out for illustration. They do not include all issues or problems addressed by FIPSE projects.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: Since it was established in 1972, the FIPSE has supported over 1140 projects selected from over 27,000 proposals. The Federal Government's portion of this effort totaled less than $135 million over the 12 years. Projects have been located in every State and most territories.

In FY 1984, the FIPSE awarded 181 grants totaling $11,710,000: 66 new grants through the Comprehensive Program, 89 second and third year grants to projects begun in 1982 and 1983 in the Comprehensive Program; 12 Final Year Dissemination grants; and 14 Mina Shaughnessy Scholars awards (see Table 2).

Table 2

Distribution of Awards by FIPSE by Program Area
Fiscal 1984

| | New Awards | | | Non Competitive Continuation Grants | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program Area | Number | Total Amount | Average Amount | Number | Total Amount | Average Amount |
| Comprehensive | 66 | $4,788,311 | $72,550 | 89 | $6,387,550 | $71,700 |
| Mina Shaughnessy Scholars | 14 | $ 339,787 | $24,271 | | | |
| Final Year Dissemination | 12 | $ 90,918 | $ 7,577 | | | |
| All Programs | 92 | $52,189,016 | $56,727 | 89 | $6,387,500 | $71,000 |

Source: See E. below

Seventy-five percent of the FIPSE grants went to individual institutions of higher education, while the remaining 25 percent of the awards were received by consortia of institutions, State agencies, professional associations and other forms of organizations involved in learning beyond K-12 schooling (see Table 3).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Table 3

Distribution of Awards FY 1983 - FY 1984

| | 1983 | 1984 |
|---|---|---|
| Total Number of Applications received: | 2,894 | 2,784 |
| Number of Grants by Institutional Type and Control: | | |
| Two-year public | 17 | 19 |
| Two-year private | 2 | 1 |
| Four-year public | 68 | 72 |
| Four-year private | 43 | 41 |
| Other (including public and private organizations) | 64 | 65 |
| (Historically Black Colleges) | (4) | (5) |
| Total | 195 | 181 |
| Federal Funds to: | | |
| Two-year public | $ 1,080,235 | $ 1,565,735 |
| Two-year private | 141,718 | 73,000 |
| Four-year public | $ 4,078,015 | $ 4,660,892 |
| Four-year private | 2,221,007 | 2,438,041 |
| Other | 3,781,000 | 2,868,898 |
| (Historically Black Colleges) | (258,597) | (301,261) |
| Total Appropriation | $11,710,000 | $11,710,000 |

Source: See E. below

In fiscal 1984, the FIPSE chose to reduce the number of grants given in order to make more large grants (see Table 4).

## Table 4

### Changes in Amounts of Comprehensive Program Awards
### Fiscal Years 1973, 1977, 1983, 1984

| | 1973 | 1977 | 1983 | 1984 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Average Award | $92,500 | $72,500 | $63,900 | $72,550 |
| Maximum Award | $375,000 | $188,616 | $166,000 | $134,955 |
| Percent of Awards Greater than $100,000 | 31 | 19 | 8 | 14 |

---

| | Percent of Total by Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ($) Award Amount[a] | 1973 | 1977 | 1983 | 1984 |
| $220-380,000 | 10 | | | |
| 200-220,000 | 5 | | | |
| 180-200,000 | 3 | 2 | | |
| 160-180,000 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| 140-160,000 | 6 | 0 | 1 | |
| 120-140,000 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 100-120,000 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 11 |
| 80-100,000 | 7 | 15 | 21 | 33 |
| 60- 80,000 | 9 | 22 | 26 | 18 |
| 40- 60,000 | 42 | 23 | 24 | 23 |
| 20- 40,000 | 8 | 17 | 16 | 11 |
| 0- 20,000 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| TOTAL: | 103[b] | 91[b] | 99[b] | 101[b] |

Note

a. Figures are in current dollars and are not adjusted for inflation.
b. Totals do not add to 100% due to rounding.

Source: See E.1 below

Special Program Initiatives: The Fund has implemented two new dissemination and management efforts.

More than 40 past and current grantees that use the computer to improve postsecondary education have agreed to reflect on their experiences and inform educators nationally about the opportunities they have found, the products they have produced, and the problems they have not been able to solve. Each participant is taking responsibility for reporting to a particular constituency, on behalf of the whole group. The group will also stimulate evaluation of these projects, by the members of the group and through subsequent projects. The participate will meet face-to-face and via a continuous computer teleconference.

## C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness - (Continued)

In FY 1984, the FIPSE also created an internal management information system to help guide its competitions. The data includes large amounts of information about the kinds of proposals being submitted by different kinds of institutions and from different areas of the country. In effect, since FIPSE urges applicants to choose topics of greatest local import, the data base becomes a map of local priorities for improvement. FIPSE intends to make serious use of this information again in 1985 to guide evaluation of proposals and the writing of competition priorities.

Program Effectiveness: A FIPSE-commissioned study was completed recently which focused on the institutionalization and adoption of the Comprehensive Grants program. This study was reported in the FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report. (E.2)

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

Appropriation language has been proposed that FIPSE grants be limited to 50 percent of project costs; currently, FIPSE grants provide about 60 percent of project costs. The Administration believes that this strategy, Federal will help to assure that institutions are fully committed to projects they wish to undertake. The reduced Federal commitment could support about 19 additional grant awards.

## E. Supporting Studies Cited in Section C Above

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, 1984.
2. Evaluation of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Final Report, Sol Pelavin Associates, Washington, D.C., 1983.

## F. Other Supporting Data

None

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

FIPSE staff is analyzing the start-up year of FIPSE projects; research will be completed in 1985 and is expected to aid grant review and monitoring. No other studies are currently in progress or planned. The data system (see above, II.C) will continue to be developed. The Mina Shaughnessy Scholars Program is due for internal review in FY 1985.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Stephen C. Ehrmann, (202) 245-8091

Program Studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

# TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SPECIAL PROGRAMS STAFF AND LEADERSHIP PERSONNEL
(CFDA No. 84.103)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1d). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization 1/ | Appropriation 1/ | Allocation 1/ |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $200,000,000 | $147,500,000 | $2,000,000 |
| 1981 | 200,000,000 | 156,500,000 | 1,000,000 |
| 1982 | 165,000,000 2/ | 150,240,000 | 960,000 |
| 1983 | 170,000,000 | 154,740,000 | 960,000 |
| 1984 | 170,000,000 | 164,740,000 | 960,000 |

Purpose: To provide training for staff and leadership personnel who are employed in, or preparing for employment in, Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, or Educational Opportunity Centers programs. Training for local project personnel is designed to improve their skills in leadership, management, academic instruction, and counseling.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education, public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations are eligible for grants. Participants may include leadership personnel, full- and part-time staff, and individuals preparing for employment as staff or leadership personnel in projects under the Special Programs.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives for this program were to:

- Publish funding priorities for the Training Program based on the Secretarial Goals for 1984.
- Consult with persons in regional and State professional associations with special knowledge of training needs of the Special Programs.
- Establish procedures for evaluating the experience of previously funded Training Program applicants.

A. Goals and Objectives - (Continued)

- Issue 11 new Training Program grants.
- Establish grant monitoring procedures to allow ED to assess individual project performance, to consider requests for new awards, and to assess overall Training Program accomplishments.
- Review Training Program regulations and policies to determine if changes are needed.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- To implement the Secretarial Goals for 1984, the Application Notice of the Training Program contained a section entitled "Funding Priorities for Fiscal Year 1984." This section detailed seven Secretarial priorities for FY 1984 Training Program grants. Applicants addressing any one of these priorities were given extra credit during the evaluation process.
- Public comments on training needs for Special Programs staff and leadership personnel were solicited at an open meeting held in Washington and through the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on the Funding Priorities for fiscal year 1984, published in the Federal Register.
- The Department developed procedures and standards for assessing prior experience of previously funded Training Program applicants and used them to assign credit for prior experience to 11 eligible applicants.
- ED received and processed 50 eligibility grant applications and awarded ten grants for Fiscal Year 1984.
- ED implemented a variety of monitoring procedures, including extensive telephone monitoring, reviews of reports and other data, and two on-site visits.
- The Training Program regulations were developed under the regulation reform policies and procedures and were published in final form in 1982. As a result of recent grant competitions, ED is considering revising the selection criteria in the regulations to better evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of a proposed training program.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: In FY 1984, $960,000 was awarded to institutions. This amount funded 10 grants, each averaging $96,000. Funding at this level will finance 1,019 participants at an average cost of $942 per person. (See E. below)

Types of Benefits Provided: The Training Program supports short-term training institutes and in-service training programs to improve the skills of staff and leadership personnel.

Program Effectiveness: No recent studies of this program have been conducted.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation

No funds were requested for this program in order to focus limited funding on the higher priority Special Services and Upward Bound programs.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

- Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

### F. Other Supporting Data

None

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Carol J. Smith, (202) 245-2715

Program studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-7884

### Notes

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students. Funds are not appropriated separately for these programs, but are allocated administratively.
2. Beginning in FY 1982 the Training Program became a discretionary grant program instead of a contract program.

## INSTITUTIONAL AID PROGRAMS
## (CFDA No. 84.031)

### I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title III, P.L. 89-329, as amended by P.L. 96-374, P.L. 98-95, P.L. 98-312 (Sec. 1), P.L. 98-139, and P.L. 98-619, (U.S.C. 1051-1069C.). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $120,000,000 | $110,000,000 |
| 1981 | 120,000,000 | 120,000,000 |
| 1982 | 129,600,000[1]/ | 134,416,000[2]/ |
| 1983 | 129,600,000[1]/ | 134,416,000[3]/ |
| 1984 | 129,600,000[1]/ | 134,416,000 |

Purpose: Assist institutions of higher education that have limited financial resources and that serve significant percentages of low-income students, to improve their academic programs, institutional management, fiscal stability, and student services; the ultimate objective is institutional self-sufficiency.

Eligibility: "Developing institutions" are defined in the legislation as institutions of higher education which: (1) provide an educational program which awards an A.A. or a B.A. degree; (2) are accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, or are making reasonable progress toward such accreditation; (3) have satisfied both of the above requirements during the five academic years preceding the academic year during which program assistance would be provided--with the exception that the five-year stipulation may be waived by the Secretary for institutions which serve to increase the amount of higher education available to American Indian, Spanish-speaking, rural, black, or low-income students; (4) enroll a relatively high percentage of low-income students receiving Federal student financial assistance; and (5) have lower education and general expenditures than do similar institutions.

### II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984 the Department's principal goals were to:

- o Maintain the Department's commitment to historically black colleges.
- o Provide technical assistance to and review of on-going projects.
- o Notify applicants by June 30, 1984 of funding status.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department made 90 awards to historically black colleges; 19 of those awards were new (as shown in Table 1).
- Program staff visited institutions in serious trouble.
- The program staff was able to provide special assistance to institutions with the greatest need.

## C. Cost, Benefits and Effectiveness

Types of Benefits:

The Title III program was originally established to provide assistance to historically black colleges or other institutions with similar problems. The Administration looks to this program as an important funding source for historically black colleges. The Program consists of four efforts as described below.

The Strengthening Institutions Program (Part A) provides one-to-three-year renewable grants and four-to-seven-year non-renewable grants. At least 25 percent of the funds appropriated under this program must be used for non-renewable grants. At least 24 percent of the funds must be awarded to two-year institutions. Funds may be used for planning or faculty development, curriculum development, special services, management improvement activities, the purchasing of equipment for curriculum and management improvement, and the shared use of facilities.

The Institutions with Special Needs Program (Part B) provides non-renewable one-to-five-year grants. Historically black colleges and universities must receive at least 50 percent of the funds which they received under Title III in fiscal year 1979, or $27,035,000. At least of 30 percent of the funds under this program must be awarded to two-year institutions. Funds may be used for planning or faculty development, curriculum development special services or management improvement activities, the purchasing of equipment for curriculum and management improvement, and the shared use of facilities.

The Challenge Grant Program (Part C) is no longer authorized to make new awards. Funds have been transferred to the Endowment Grant Program.

The Endowment Grant Program (Part C) provides eligible institutions with a Federal government match of institutionally raised endowment funds. The minimum award is for $50,000, and the maximum award is $250,000 for FY 1984, and $500,000 thereafter. Institutions are eligible to receive two grants within a five-year cycle. The cycle begins the first year that an institution receives an award. An institution must, however, establish eligibility for program participation each year it applies for funds. There are no restrictions on the use of the income produced by the endowment except that an institution may not spend more than 50 percent of the annual income produced. The endowment corpus may not be spent for the 20-year grant period.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

### Table 1

### Institutional Aid Program Obligations by Institutional Ethnicity, Level of Offering, and Control, Fiscal Year 1983[a]

| | Noncompeting Continuations | | New Projects | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ethnicity** | **Number** | **Obligations** | **Number** | **Obligations** | **Number** | **Obligations** |
| Historically Black | 71 | $34,154,103 | 19 | $7,393,767 | 90 | $41,547,870 |
| White | 344 | $80,536,305 | 49 | $5,827,704 | 393 | $86,364,009 |
| Native American | 6 | $ 1,500,063 | 2 | $ 280,875 | 8 | $ 1,780,938 |
| Asian Pacific | 3 | $ 927,191 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 927,191 |
| Hispanic | 10 | $ 2,458,145 | 5 | $ 585,516 | 15 | $ 2,996,661 |
| **Level of Offering and Control** | | | | | | |
| 4-Year Private | 157 | $44,963,382 | 18 | $4,713,535 | 175 | $49,676,917 |
| 4-Year Public | 82 | $27,990,019 | 16 | $4,116,721 | 98 | $32,106,740 |
| 2-Year Private | 25 | $ 4,250,174 | 7 | $1,200,024 | 32 | $ 5,450,198 |
| 2-Year Public | 170 | $42,373,232 | 34 | $4,010,582 | 204 | $46,382,814 |
| Total: | 434 | $119,575,807 | 75 | $14,040,862 | 509 | $133,616,669[b] |

a. An additional $296,050 will be funded from FY 1984 funds for proposals submitted for FY 1983 competition.

b. Supplemental funds for 1983 provided an additional $284,122 for Historically Black Colleges and $615,684 for other minority institutions.

Source: See E.1. below

Program Scope: Table 2 provides a detailed breakdown on the distribution of awards by part for each type of grant in FY 1983 and FY 1984. In FY 1984 5.2 million from Part B was transferred to the new Endowment Grant Program.

The historically black colleges receive significant funding from this program. The Administration, to meet its goal of increasing Federal funding to black colleges, has made significant improvement in increasing black college funding through this program. The improvement can be seen in Table 1: black colleges represent 29 percent of the continuation funding but account for 53 percent of the new funding. Black colleges account for 16 percent of the colleges that have continuation finding but account for 25 percent of the colleges with new funding.

Program Effectiveness: In October 1983, the Department completed a study of the Institutional Aid Program and a workbook for program managers. The workbook suggests that funded activities must be an integral part of the institution's development plan if the activities are to be successful. The president and other principal administrative officers must support these plans and have an active role in the institution's developmental activities. There must be strong administrative support for activities begun before receipt of Federal funds. Accounting procedures must be in place to track developmental costs of the project.

As the study explained, to be successful an activity must make a significant contribution to the institution's development and viability. Development may be less a matter of growth than a matter of attaining a modest, more cost-effective operation. Conversely, developmental activities may lead to desirable but more costly operation with the potential for increased revenue. In either case, as the study showed, these developmental activities take more time than is commonly believed. The study also showed that the institution must be committed to the success of the activity; in fact, if the Federal funding exceeds 10 percent of the institutional revenue, the institution is not financially committed and the activities will fail.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The FY 1984 funding level was $134,416,000. Appropriation language was added in both FY 1984 and FY 1985 to ensure funding for historically black colleges at a level of not less than $45,741,000, an increase over the FY 1983 obligation. The appropriation language applies the setaside for black colleges to all of Title III, and not just for Part B as is stated in the legislation.

The Challenge Grant Program is being terminated. No new awards have been made since FY 1983. Challenge Grant funds, except for those needed to complete non-competing continuation awards through FY 1986, have been combined with the funds that must be provided from the cost-sharing portion of the Special Needs Program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Obligations by Program, Fiscal Years/1983 and 1984

| Descriptive Measures | Number of Awards | | Number of New Awards | | Average Award | | Federal Cost in thousands | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1983 | 1984 | 1983 | 1984 | 1983 | 1984 | 1983 | 1984 |
| Part A: Strengthening Program | | | | | | | | |
| Planning Grants | 11 | 7 | -- | -- | $ 24 | $ 23 | $269 | $159 |
| 1- to 3-Year Grants | 120 | 118 | 31 | 19 | $141 | $127 | $16,979 | $14,978 |
| 4- to 7-Year Grants | 147 | 152 | -- | 0 | $306 | $311 | $45,025 | $47,271 |
| Part B: Special Needs | | | | | | | | |
| 1- to 5-Year Awards | 175 | 176 | 18 | 0 | $353 | $325 | $61,846 | $57,193 |
| Part C: Challenge Grants | 56 | 45 | 14 | 0 | $170 | $171 | $9,500 | $7,680 |
| Part C: Endowment Grants | | N/A | | N/A | | N/A | | $7,135 |
| Program Total: | 509 | 498 | | | | | | |
| Total Cost: | | | | | | | $133,617 | $134,416 |

Source: See E.1 below

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation - (Continued)

The Department has proposed to consolidate the current four-program configuration into two programs. The similar programs under Part A and Part B will be merged into a single program. The Endowment Grant Program will be maintained and the Challenge Grant Program will be phased out.

The Department has proposed simplifying the eligibility rules. Instead of using six eligibility criteria in two programs, the Department has proposed two criteria and one program.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

2. Davis, Junius; Ironside, Roderick; and Van Sant, Jerry, Factors Associated with Successful Developmental Investment in Title III Eligible Institutions: A Special Report to Program Managers in the U.S. Department of Education, Raleigh, N.C.: Research Triangle Institute, October 1983.

## F. Other Supporting Data

None

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

An evaluation of 51 Title III recipients was recently completed (see E.2 below). No new studies are planned.

## Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Caroline J. Gillin, (202) 245-2384

Program studies: James Maxwell, (202) 245-7884

## Notes

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 effectively raised the authorization level from $129,600,000 to the higher appropriation for FY 1982, FY 1983 and FY 1984.

2. Includes a $10 million supplemental appropriation.

3. Includes a $4,816,000 supplemental appropriation in the FY 1983 supplemental appropriation bill.

# MINORITY INSTITUTIONS SCIENCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
# (CFDA No. 84.120)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: National Science Foundation Act of 1950, Section 3(a)(1), Public Law 81-507, as amended, (42 U.S.C. 1862); Department of Education Organization Act, Section 304, (20 U.S.C. 3444) Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, Sections 515(d) and 528 (3) as extended by General Educational Provisions Act, Section 414 (20 U.S.C. 1226a). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $5,000,000 | $5,000,000 |
| 1981 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| 1982 | 5,000,000 | 4,800,000 |
| 1983 | 5,000,000 | 4,800,000 |
| 1984 | 5,000,000 | 4,800,000 |

Purpose: To help minority institutions improve the quality of preparation of their students for graduate work or careers in science; to improve the access of undergraduate minority students to careers in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering; to improve access for precollege minority students to careers in science and engineering through community outreach programs conducted through eligible minority colleges and universities; and to improve the capability of minority institutions for self-assessment, management, and evaluation of their science programs and dissemination of their results.

Eligibility: Private and public accredited 2- and 4-year institutions of higher education are eligible if their enrollments are predominantly (50 percent or more) American Indian; Alaskan Native; black, not of Hispanic origin; Hispanic; Pacific Islander; or any combination of these or other disadvantaged ethnic minorities who are underrepresented in science and engineering. Proposals may also be submitted by non-profit science-oriented organizations, professional scientific societies, and all non-profit accredited colleges and universities which will render a needed service to a group of institutions for the Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program (MISIP) or provide in-service training for project directors, scientists or engineers from eligible minority institutions.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

- Maintain the Department's commitment to minority institutions.
- Provide participants with technical assistance and conduct audit reviews.
- Complete processing of grant applications within 6 months of closing notice.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department processed all grants in a timely manner.
- The Department's commitment to program was maintained for FY 1985.
- Technical assistance in FY 1984 was limited.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: Distribution of the awards in FY 1983 was similar to that in FY 1982. Most of the funds were expended for Institutional, Cooperative or Special grants. In FY 84, no proposal was rated high enough to be funded in the Cooperative and Design categories. Total awards fell from 39 in FY 1983 to 34 in FY 1984.

Table 1

Total Aid Average Distribution of Awards for
Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program
For Fiscal Years 1982, 1983, and 1984

| | | AWARDS | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1982 | | 1983 | | 1984 | |
| Award Type | Max. Size and Duration | Amount Number | Average Amount | Amount Number | Average Amount | Amount Number | Average Amount |
| Institutional | $300,000<br>(3 yrs) | $3,158,400<br>(14) | $225,600 | $2,946,000<br>(14) | $210,429 | $3,703,396<br>(16) | $231, |
| Cooperative | $300,000<br>(3 yrs) | $490,558<br>(2) | $245,279 | $527,232<br>(2) | $263,616 | 0<br>0 | - |
| Design | $20,000<br>(1 yr.) | $39,260<br>(2) | $19,630 | $55,210<br>(3) | $18,403 | 0<br>0 | - |
| Special | $150,000<br>(2 yrs) | $1,100,518<br>(20) | $55,026 | $1,130,000<br>(20) | $56,500 | $1,086,604<br>(18) | $60,367 |

SOURCE: See E. below.

Program Effectiveness: Staff analysis of the interim and final grants reveal that more than 75 percent of the grant-initiated activities have been in some cases, institutional records were sufficient to assess the program, but the program should be better documented by the institution so that the performance of this program can be assessed. (see E. below)

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

Program priorities will be improving the quality of instruction in mathematics and science at minority institutions, and improving access for minority students to careers in science and engineering.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

- o Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

### F. Other Supporting Data

Table 2 indicates that 172 out of 260 eligible institutions (66 percent) participated in the program through FY 1984.

Table 2

Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program
Institutional Participation FY 1972-84

| Predominant Minority Group | Number Eligible a/ | Number of Awards | Number of Institutions Receiving Awards b/ |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alaskan Native | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| American Indian | 25 | 26 | 19 b/ |
| Black | 158 | 211 | 110 b/ |
| Mexican American | 16 | 17 | 10 |
| Puerto Rican | 25 | 37 | 17 |
| Micronesian | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Combination | 30 | 29 | 14 b/ |
| TOTAL | 260 a/ | 343 | 172 b/ |

a. Does not include 34 institutions whose eligibility/accreditation is uncertain or which are not-accredited.

b. Includes nine non-accredited American Indian institutions, and one Hawaiian institution not included in the current eligibility count.

Source: See E. above

### III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies are in progress or planned.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Argelia Velez Rodriguez, (202) 245-3253

Program studies: Jim Maxwell, (202) 245-7884

# LAW SCHOOL CLINICAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.097)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IX, Part E, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1134n-1134p). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 7,500,000 | $4,000,000 |
| 1981 | 5,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| 1982 | 1,000,000 | 960,000 |
| 1983 | 1,000,000 | 605,000 |
| 1984 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |

Purpose: To establish or expand programs in accredited law schools to provide clinical experience to law students.

Eligibility: Individual accredited law schools and a combination or consortium of accredited law schools.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the major program objectives were to continue funding successful projects, and to fund new projects that met the funding criteria.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1984, 44 applicants were awarded $1 million.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: During academic year 1983-84, about 870 law students benefited from a supervised clinical experience supported by the 29 project grants. Most of these students gained legal experience in the preparation and trial of actual cases, including administrative cases and the settlement of suits outside the courtroom, by providing real services, under supervision, to actual clients.

Types of Benefits Provided: The Law School Clinical Experience program supports expanded supervision of students engaged in clinical experience while allowing institutions to develop and expand their clinical curricula.

Program Scope: For academic year 1983-84, $605,000 was awarded from fiscal year 1983 funds to support clinical legal education programs at 29 law schools. The average grant was about $21,000. Academic year 1984-85 grant award amounts will be slightly higher.

Program Effectiveness: Since the program was first funded in FY 1978, more than 100 law schools have received $12.5 million to support their clinical legal education program. These grants have enabled law schools to:

1. Develop new areas of clinical experience and incorporate them in law school curriculum.
2. Increase the participation of law school faculty in the supervision of students in clinical legal education programs.
3. Provide appropriate and improved supervision of students enrolled in clinical programs.
4. Increase the number of students participating in clinical programs.
5. Improve skills of law students in interviewing witnesses, conducting investigation and analysis, counseling clients, negotiating compromises, drafting documents, advocating before legal decisionmakers, and training in professional responsibility.
6. Develop appropriate plans to assume the entire costs of these programs without Federal funding.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

Most of the nation's accredited law schools now have programs of clinical experience. For example, the Ford Foundation-sponsored Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility has spent about $7 million over the past 10 years to support about 100 clinical legal education programs. Law schools are now including such clinics in their regular budgets. Consequently, the Administration sees no justification for continued Federal funding of this program.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

- Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

### F. Other Supporting Data

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are planned or in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

# LEGAL TRAINING FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
## (CFDA No. 84.136)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IX, Part D; as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1134l-1134m). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | Indefinite | $1,000,000 |
| 1981 | $5,000,000 | 1,000,000 |
| 1982 | 1,000,000 | 960,000 |
| 1983 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |
| 1984 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |

Purpose: To assist persons from disadvantaged backgrounds to undertake training in the legal profession.

Eligibility: Public and private agencies and organizations other than institutions of higher education are eligible to apply for grants or contracts under this program. A noncompetitive project grant is awarded annually to the Council on Legal Educational Opportunity (CLEO) to administer the program.

The law schools are expected to absorb half the cost of the summer institutes and to provide tuition scholarships, as well as other forms of financial aid, to CLEO students. Federal support for CLEO generates an estimated $3 million annually in cash and services from the law schools.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

- Redress the substantial underrepresentation of minority and economically disadvantaged groups within the legal profession.
- Serve those persons who aspire and are qualified to enter the legal profession but who because of substantial economic deficiency and marginal admissions credentials, may be unable to gain admission to law school under prevailing standards.
- Provide these students with the opportunity for law school matriculation through the operation of summer institutes and the provision of annual fellowships.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

Support through this program has enabled the Council on Legal Education Opportunity, in concert with participating law schools, to:

- Identify prospective law students in need of services provided by the program.
- Conduct seven regional institutes across the country to provide intensive pre-law training to students in the summer prior to their entrance into law school; evaluate each student at the end of the institute, in terms of his/her potential for successfully mastering the law school curriculum; and provide law school placement assistance for all successful students.
- Provide $1,000 annual stipends to all students who have successfully completed the summer institutes and are enrolled in a law school accredited by the American Bar Association.
- Maintain records concerning law school enrollment, bar performance, and employment data of individuals served by the program.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: In the 1982-83 academic year, 229 new students and 308 continuing students were supported. In 1983-84, 210 new students 327 continuing students were supported. Altogether about 3,500 students have participated in the CLEO program at about 150 law schools. Table 1 summarizes awards for FY 1983 and 1984.

Institutes: During academic year 1983-84, more than 200 potential first-year law students received six weeks of intensive pre-law training during the summer at seven law schools selected by CLEO to run these institutes. About 99 percent of these students completed the institutes and were admitted to law schools. They joined over 300 other CLEO students in their second or third year of legal study.

Types of Benefits Provided: The CLEO program has two central components of direct service to students in addition to its services to the law schools. The two primary student components are six-week summer institutes of intensive legal study for prospective law students and annual fellowships of $1,000 to those successful graduates of the summer institutes who attend law schools. Participating law schools also waive tuition and fees for these students.

Program Effectiveness: In the past 15 years, CLEO has helped 3,480 students from disadvantaged backgrounds gain admission to law schools. As of February 1983, 1,771 CLEO students had successfully completed law schools. (See E below.)

Table 1

Summary of Awards and Expenses for CLEO,
Academic Years 1983-84 and 1984-85

| | Academic 1983-84[a] | | Academic 1984-85[a] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Amount | Number of Students | Amount | Number of Students |
| New Awards - | $229,000 | 229 | $210,000 | 210 |
| Continuations - | 308,000 | 308 | 328,000 | 327 |
| Summer Institutes - | 210,000 | 200 (est.) | 210,000 | 200 (est.) |
| CLEO - Administrative Costs | 253,000 | --- | 252,000 | --- |
| Total | $100,000 | 737 | $100,000 | 737 |

[a] Funds for Academic Year 1983-84 were appropriated in Fiscal Year 1983 while funds for Academic Year 1984-85 were appropriated in Fiscal Year 1984.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

During its first two years of operation, the program was funded solely from private sources. With Federal assistance, the program gained visibility and demonstrated its effectiveness in training disadvantaged individuals for successful careers in the legal profession. Now recognized as effective, this program should attract support from businesses and other organizations which have a direct interest in training or employing CLEO fellows providing strong justification for the Administration's proposed elimination of this program.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984

## F. Other Supporting Data

### Table 2

Racial Composition of CLEO Participants in
Academic Year 1981-82 and 1982-83[1] (E.)

| | 1981-82 | | 1982-83 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent of Total | Number | Percent of Total |
| Black | 301 | 54.2 | 326 | 61.4 |
| Hispanic Americans | 199 | 35.9 | 158 | 29.8 |
| Asian Americans | 19 | 3.4 | 18 | 3.4 |
| American Indians | 3 | .5 | 8 | 1.5 |
| Caucasians | 13 | 2.3 | 15 | 2.8 |
| Others | 20 | 3.6 | 6 | 1.1 |
| TOTAL | 555 | 99.9 | 531 | 100.0 |

Source: See E. above.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are in progress or planned.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-7884

### Note

1. Of the total CLEO students in 1982-83, 283 or (53 percent) were women.

# FELLOWSHIPS FOR GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDY
(CFDA No. 84.094)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IX, Part B, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1134d-1134g). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | 1/ | 1/ |
| 1981 | $60,000,000 2/ | $12,000,000 |
| 1982 | 14,000,000 | 10,560,000 |
| 1983 | 14,000,000 | 11,920,000 |
| 1984 | 14,000,000 | 13,500,000 |

Purpose: To assist graduate and professional students who demonstrate financial need. Fellowships may be awarded to support students in the following categories: (1) Graduate and Professional Opportunity Fellowships, awarded to individuals from groups who are underrepresented in graduate or professional study; (2) Public Service Education Fellowships, awarded to individuals who plan to begin or continue a career in public service; and (3) Mining Fellowships, awarded to individuals who plan to study domestic mining and mineral fuel conservation.

Eligibility: Any institution of higher education with a graduate or professional program leading to an advanced or professional degree.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships are intended:

- To provide access to graduate and professional education for qualified minorities and women who otherwise might be unable to obtain graduate level education;
- To meet national employment needs for well trained individuals, particularly minorities and women, in career fields of high national priority;
- To provide incentives to institutions of higher education to recruit 500 new students, maintain 700 continuation students, and graduate 500 minority and women students in high quality professional and academic programs.

## A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

Public Service Fellowships are intended:

- To provide access to graduate education in the public service areas for 259 qualified minorities and women who otherwise might be unable to obtain graduate level education;
- To increase the representation of minorities and women at the highest levels of public service, especially at the State and local levels; and
- To provide incentives to institutions of higher education to recruit 120 new students, maintain 130 continuation students, and graduate 100 minority and women students in high-quality public service programs.

Because no funds were appropriated for Mining Fellowships for FY 1984, the goals and objectives for this program have not been established.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships

- Grantees recruited 1015 minority students and women for fellowships in the fields of study selected during the peer review process.
- More than 50 percent of fellowships were awarded in the physical sciences, engineering, and life sciences.
- The program awarded $1,300,000 in fellowships to 15 historically black colleges and universities in the FY 1984 competition.

Public Service Fellowships

- The program encouraged practical experiences and internships in public administration positions as an integral part of the curriculum for MPA programs.
- The composition of the students participating in the program has changed from predominantly white males to predominantly women and minority males.
- The program supported five historically black colleges and universities by awarding about $164,000 in fellowships to students at those institutions under the FY 1984 competition.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: In FY 1984, ED awarded fellowship stipends based on financial need up to a maximum of $4,500 per 12-month period. It also allowed an institutional allowance of $3,900 per year for each fellow

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

enrolled in the program. Fellows must be full-time students and ordinarily cannot have the fellowships renewed beyond a 36-month period.

## Program Scope

### Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships

From fiscal year 1984 funds, 138 grants totaling $11 million were made to colleges and universities to support 777 students in their second or third year of full-time graduate or professional study, and to support another 547 new students beginning study during 1984-85. The fellows are expected to study in academic and professional areas in roughly the same proportions as they have previously.

Table 1
Distribution of Award
By Area for Academic Year 1984-85

| 1984-85 | Number of Awards | Percent of Total |
|---|---|---|
| Physical Sciences | 256 | 19.3 |
| Engineering | 274 | 20.1 |
| Life Sciences | 245 | 18.5 |
| Social Sciences | 197 | 14.9 |
| Psychology | 60 | 4.5 |
| Humanities | 24 | 1.8 |
| Professions: | | |
| Law | 184 | 13.9 |
| Business | 72 | 5.4 |
| Education | 12 | 1.0 |
| | 1,324 | 100.0 |

Source: See E. below.

### Public Service Fellowships

From fiscal year 1984 funds, 58 grants totaling $2.5 million were made to colleges and universities to support 137 students in their second year of full-time graduate study, and to support another 122 new students beginning their first year of study during 1984-85 in the field of public administration or closely related areas. Fellows supported under the program are restricted to study in the field of Public Administration or to closely related areas such as urban affairs, public policy analysis, international affairs, and environmental/natural resources administration.

## Program Effectiveness

### Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships

Final reports received during the fall of 1983 indicate that 60 students were awarded Ph.Ds., and 193 students were awarded masters degrees or the first professional degree in law. The doctoral degrees were earned in the following areas:

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Table 2
Distribution of Ph.D's by Area
Academic Year 1982-83

| | Ph.Ds. | Percent of Total |
|---|---|---|
| Life Sciences | 20 | 33.3 |
| Physical Sciences | 23 | 38.3 |
| Engineering/Computer Science | 8 | 13.3 |
| Social Sciences | 8 | 13.3 |
| Other Professions | 1 | 1.7 |
| | 60 | 99.9 |

Source: See E. below.

### Public Service Fellowships

In Academic Year 1983-84 an estimated 140 Public Service fellows received master's degrees in public administration or closely related fields. Institutional projections indicate that another 150 will be awarded a master's degree during 1983-84. Detailed information on program participants by race and sex is provided under Section F below.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration has requested no funds for the Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships program. Currently, there is a wide variety of non-Federal sources of financial support available for minorities and women pursuing graduate study, especially in engineering and science. These include support from postsecondary institutions, foundations, and other private sources. Federal financial assistance is available to graduate students through the Work Study program and the National Direct Student Loan program. In addition, through the Guaranteed Student Loan program's Auxiliary Loan Assistance, graduate students will be eligible for loans of up to $8,000 annually.

Also, there is no need for Federal encouragement of graduate study in the public service field. Many institutions currently offer high level, high quality graduate programs in public administration and there is already a substantial supply of qualified persons to fill public service jobs. The number of master's degrees awarded in public service fields increased by 141.5 percent between academic years 1970-71 and 1978-79, and doctoral degrees awarded in these fields increased by 106.7 percent during the same period. Graduate students in public service fields are eligible to receive Federal financial assistance through the Work-Study program and the National Direct Student Loan program. Under the Guaranteed Student Loan program's Auxiliary Loan Assistance, graduate students will be eligible for loans of up to $8,000 per year to support their education.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above

Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

## F. Other Supporting Data

Program participation by sex and race follow for each program:

### Graduate and Professional Opportunities Program

On the basis of five years of program experience, it is expected that the distribution of 1984 fellows by sex and race will be similar to the fiscal year 1983 distribution, which was as follows:

Table 3
Distribution of Fellows in the Graduate and Professional Study Program
By Race - Academic Year 1983-84

| | Number of Fellows | Percent of Total |
|---|---|---|
| Black | 598 | 49.8 |
| Hispanic | 266 | 22.2 |
| Asian American | 61 | 5.1 |
| Native American | 50 | 4.2 |
| White Women | 225 | 18.8 |
| Total | 1200 | 100.0 |

Women accounted for more than 50 percent of the fellows in the academic year 1983-84 program. (Source: See E. above.)

### Public Service Fellowships

The composition of the students participating in the program has changed from predominantly white male to predominantly women and minority males. The number of minority and female participants is expected to gradually increase. The FY 1984 distribution is as follows:

Table 4
Distribution of Awards in the Public Service Fellowships Program
By Ethnicity for Academic Year 1984-85

| ETHNICITY | Number of Fellows | Percent of Total |
|---|---|---|
| White | | |
| Men | 83 | 32 |
| Women | 99 | 38 |
| Black | 42 | 16 |
| Hispanic | 27 | 10.4 |
| Asian-American | 7 | 2.7 |
| Native American | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 259 | 100 |

Women accounted for about 63 percent of the fellows in the academic year 1984-85 program (Source: See E. above).

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

### Notes

1. The Education Amendments (P.L. 96-374) of 1980 provided for a new Part B of Title IX of HEA of 1965. The new Part B voids and replaces the old Part B (Graduate/Professional Education Opportunities Program), Part C (Public Service Fellowships), and Part D (Domestic Mining and Mineral and Mineral Fuel Conservation Fellowships) and constitutes a new Part B in which the separate authorities were combined into one authority. For information on each program prior to FY 1981, see the ED Annual Evaluation Report for FY 1981.

2. Under the consolidated Part B, Section (e), at least as much money must be spent each year on Public Service Fellowships, Mining Fellowships, and Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships as was spent in FY 1979 for each of these categories.

# FULBRIGHT-HAYS TRAINING GRANTS PROGRAM
(CFDA Nos. 84.019, 84.020, 84.021, 84.022)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Fulbright-Hays Act), Section 102(b)(6) P.L. 87-256, (22 U.S.C. 2452 (b)(6)) and Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Sections 104(b)(2) and (3) P.L. 83-480, (7 U.S.C. 1691). (No expiration date).

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | 1/ | $3,000,000 |
| 1981 | | 6,200,000 |
| 1982 | | 4,800,000 |
| 1983 | | 5,000,000 |
| 1984 | | 5,000,000 |

Purpose: This program provides for faculty research abroad, foreign curriculum consultants, group projects abroad, and doctoral dissertation research abroad.

### Faculty Research Abroad

To strengthen programs of international studies at universities and colleges by providing opportunities for research and study abroad in foreign language and area studies, by enabling faculty members to keep current in their specialties, facilitating curriculum updating, and by helping to improve teaching methods and materials.

### Foreign Curriculum Consultants

To enable institutions to bring specialists from other countries to the United States to help plan and develop curricula in modern foreign languages and area studies.

### Group Projects Abroad

To help educational institutions improve their programs in modern foreign languages and areas.

### Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad

To provide opportunities for graduate students to do full-time dissertation research abroad in modern foreign languages and area studies and to develop research knowledge and capability about areas of the world not widely studied in American institutions.

Eligibility:

Faculty Research Abroad

Any accredited American college or university offering instruction in foreign languages and area studies. Faculty candidates must be U.S. citizens or nationals who are experienced in foreign language and area studies. Candidates must have engaged in at least half-time teaching or research relevant to their area of specialization during the two years preceding the date of the award and must possess adequate skills in the language of the country or a language germane to the region where the project would be undertaken.

Foreign Curriculum Consultants

State departments of education, local public school systems, accredited institutions of higher education, private non-profit educational organizations, or a consortium of these institutions.

Group Projects Abroad

Accredited universities, 4-year colleges, community and junior colleges, State departments of education, private nonprofit educational organizations, or a consortium of institutions.

Eligible individuals must be (1) U.S. citizens or nationals and (2) faculty members in foreign language or area studies; experienced educators responsible for conducting, planning, or supervising programs in foreign language or area studies at the elementary, secondary, or junior college levels; or graduate students or upperclassmen who plan teaching careers in foreign languages, area studies, or world affairs.

Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad

Candidates must be U.S. citizens or nationals or permanent residents of the United States; plan to teach in a U.S. institution of higher education; be enrolled in an eligible U.S. institution; be admitted to candidacy for a doctoral degree in foreign language or area studies; and, provide evidence of adequate foreign language skills to carry out effectively the proposed research.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

The goal and objectives for FY 1984 were to award project grants and fellowships within the prescribed schedule.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

Faculty Research Abroad: Following a national competition including domestic peer review and overseas host country approval, the Department made 38 awards to institutions for individual Faculty Research Fellowships.

B. Progress and Accomplishments - (Continued)

Foreign Curriculum Consultants: Twenty-five applications, representing 13 states, for the Foreign Curriculum Consultants program were received. All applications were reviewed by a panel of external academic experts, by ED staff, and by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, which resulted in nine awards.

Group Projects Abroad: Ninety-five applications were received from 30 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico for Group Projects Abroad. All applications were reviewed by a panel of experts, ED staff and by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, which resulted in awards.

Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad: After a national competition that involved domestic peer review and overseas host country approval, 108 awards were made for individual research fellowships.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: The following awards were made in FY 1984:

- Faculty Research Abroad: 38 fellowships at 26 institutions for a total amount of $778,251.
- Foreign Curriculum Consultants: nine projects for a total of $205,000.
- Group Projects Abroad: 34 projects for a total of $2,278,114; 23 projects used U.S. dollars in the amount of $1,604,569 and 11 projects were supported under the U.S.-owned foreign currency category for a total of $673,545.
- Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad: 108 fellowships to 26 institutions for a total of $1,599,749.
- Special Bi-lateral Projects: eight projects for a total of $660,000 in Italy, Israel, South Korea, China, Brazil, Liberia, India, and Pakistan.

Program Effectiveness: No studies are planned or completed.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

- The Administrations did not request funds for these activities for fiscal year 1985, which reflected the Administration's effort to curtail Federal discretionary expenditures and to encourage individuals, institutions, businesses, and other organizations to provide a greater share of support for international education and foreign language studies.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above

Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

### F. Other Supporting Data

See Program Effectiveness (Section II.C) in Foreign Language Training and Area Studies.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are in progress or planned.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Kenneth D. Whitehead, (202) 245-9691

Program studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

### Note

1. Indefinite authorization for these activities.

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRAINING AND AREA STUDIES
# (CFDA Nos. 84.015, 84.016, 84.017, 84.153)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VI, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $75,000,000 | $17,000,000 |
| 1981 | 52,750,000 | 19,800,000 |
| 1982 | 30,600,000 | 19,200,000 |
| 1983 | 30,600,000 | 21,000,000 |
| 1984 | 30,600,000 | 25,800,000 |

### Purposes

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Languages Programs: To (1) assist institutions of higher education to plan, develop, and carry out a comprehensive program to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages, and (2) assist associations and organizations to develop projects that will make an especially significant contribution to strengthening and improving undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages.

National Resource Centers: To promote instruction in those modern foreign languages and area and international studies critical to national needs by supporting the establishment, strengthening and operation of such programs at colleges and universities.

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships: To meet the needs of the United States for experts in modern foreign languages, area studies, and world affairs by supporting fellowships for advanced study at institutions for higher education.

International Research and Studies: To improve foreign language and area studies training through support of research and studies, experimentation, and development of specialized instructional materials.

Business and International Education Programs: To provide suitable international education and training for business personnel in various stages of professional development, and to promote education and training that will contribute to the ability of U.S. businesses to prosper in an international economy.

### Eligibility

Undergraduate Programs: Accredited colleges and universities, and public and private non-profit agencies and organizations.

Eligibility - (Continued)

Centers: Accredited American colleges and universities.

Fellowships: Accredited institutions of higher education offering comprehensive graduate language and area and international studies are eligible to apply for award quotas.

Research and Studies: Institutions of higher education; qualified individual researchers; State educational agencies; public school systems; and other educational and professional organizations.

Business Programs: Accredited colleges and universities linked with the business community engaged in foreign commerce.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

In FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives for these program components were:

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Languages Programs

- Strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages;
- Strengthen the acquisition of knowledge and skills in professional fields that have an international component, such as agriculture, business, education, law, and journalism, or that develop skills for the analysis of critical issues such as economic development, technology utilization, national security, or international trade;
- Increase the use of computers to teach modern foreign languages and to collect and analyze information about critical international issues.

National Resource Centers

- Urge grantees to adopt standards and testing procedures compatible with the most recent standards adopted by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign languages;
- Initiate or strengthen linkages between language and area studies and professional schools;
- Strengthen the language programs by increasing to 10 hours of instruction per week in grantees' introductory and intermediate language skill courses, and add advanced third- and fourth-year regular language skill courses;
- Begin or strengthen summer intensive language institutes;
- Initiate or expand outreach activities in teacher education through technical assistance and in-service training in language and area studies and international education.

A. Goals and Objectives: (Continued)

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships

- o Award fellowships to students who combine language and area studies with professional studies;
- o Award fellowships to students studying the less commonly taught languages and cultures of non-Western countries;
- o Award fellowships to students or faculty members enrolled in advanced, intensive foreign language programs.

Business and International Education

- o Promote innovation and improvement in international business education curricula and increase the international skills of the business community through linkages between institutions of higher education and the business community.

The International Research and Studies Program

- o To emphasize the improvement of foreign language instruction through research.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs

- o All funded projects included a component designed to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in modern foreign languages.
- o Two funded projects, including one submitted by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, incorporated an international perspective into the core program of professional studies for teachers. The Educational Testing Service will conduct a series of workshops to train teachers of French, German, and Spanish in oral proficiency testing techniques.
- o Many projects included computer assisted instruction in foreign languages, or use inter-active TV instructional systems for the teaching of international studies and foreign languages.

National Resource Centers

- o Additional funds were allocated for work on proficiency testing using the most recent guidance from the Americn Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Proficiency testing was included as a priority activity for the Centers applying for FY 1985 funding.
- o Technical assistance and comments on non-competing continuation applications for FY 1984 stressed the need to improve intra-university linkages, particularly with professional schools.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments - (Continued)

- Additional funds were allocated for intensifying introductory and intermediate language instruction or for adding third or fourth year language skill courses.

- FY 1984 center grants, which cover the summer of 1985, include allocations for the development of cooperative summer intensive language programs.

- Additional funds were devoted to teacher education activities and outreach in the teacher education field will be a priority in FY 1985 funding.

### Foreign Language and Area Studies

- Combining language and area studies with professional school programs has been made a program funding priority. Data are not yet available on the actual award patterns.

- At least 75 percent of the fellowship awards were for the less-commonly taught non-Western languages.

- Fellowship awards for students and faculty to participate in summer intensive language programs were increased, as a percentage of all fellowships, from 10.2 percent for the summer of 1984 to 13.8 percent for summer 1985.

### Business and International Education

- All grantees have linkage agreements with the business community involved in export related trade or international economic activities.

### The International Research and Studies Program

- Funded projects include those focusing on language proficiency testing, developing new instructional materials, use of computers in language instruction, and improving teaching methodologies and language acquisition. One project will develop a guidebook on how to evaluate foreign language programs at the college level.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

### Program Scope:

National Resource Centers: 91 centers were funded in fiscal year 1984 as non-competing continuation awards, 78 of them comprehensive graduate and undergraduate and 13 of them undergraduate. The average unit cost for comprehensive centers was $139,460 and for undergraduate centers $94,011. The total Centers budget of $12.1 million was awarded.

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships: Non-competing continuation awards for fellowships were made to 117 institutions representing the equivalent of about 800 academic year fellowships; about 14 percent of the funds will be used for summer awards for advanced intensive language training.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness: (Continued)

Program Effectiveness: The Rand Corporation recently completed the second part of a two-phase evaluation of the Foreign Language and Area Studies Program. This study analyzed supply and demand trends for foreign language and area studies graduates, and assessed the relationships between employment and program-supported training. This study was reported in the FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report. (See E.2 below).

Table 1
A Summary of Funding By Program Areas
Fiscal Years 1982, 1983, and 1984

| | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs | | | |
| No. of awards | 50 | 54 | 71 |
| Avg. cost per program | $38,760 | $42,592 | $42,254 |
| Total | $1,938,000 | $2,300,000 | $3,000,000 |
| National Resource Centers | | | |
| No. of centers | 90 | 91 | 91 |
| Avg. cost per center | $113,045 | $116,480 | $132,967 |
| Total | $10,174,000 | $10,600,000 | $12,100,000 |
| Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships | | | |
| No. of institutions | 113 | 117 | 117 |
| No. of fellowships | 800 | 700 | 800 |
| Avg. cost per fellowship (academic year) | $7,406 | $8,570 | $9,000 |
| Total | $5,925,000 | $6,000,000 | $7,200,000 |
| International Research and Studies | | | |
| No. of awards | 29 | 22 | 27 |
| Avg. cost per study | $40,103 | $46,000 | $55,556 |
| Total | $1,163,000 | $920,000 | $1,500,000 |
| Business and International Education Program | | | |
| No. of awards | -- | 22 | 37 |
| Avg. cost per project | -- | $45,000 | $54,054 |
| Total | -- | $1,000,000 | $2,000,000 |
| Total, All Programs | $19,200,000 | $21,000,000 | $25,800,000 |

Source: See E.1 below.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration did not request funds for these activities for fiscal year 1985. Many of the institutions receiving assistance under this program have done so for many years, and these activities are now well-established parts of their curricula. The Administration believes that full funding responsibility should be assumed by the institutions themselves.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

2. *Federal Support for Training for Language and Area Specialists: The Education and Careers of FLAS Fellowship Recipients* (final report for phase two of a two-part study for the U.S. Department of Education), Lorraine M. McDonnell and others, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, 1983.

### F. Other Supporting Data

None

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies of this program are planned or in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Kenneth D. Whitehead, (202) 245-9691

Program studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

# COOPERATIVE EDUCATION
## (CFDA No. 84.055)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VIII (20 U.S.C. 1133 - 1133b.) as amended, Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (P.L. 97-35, Title V, Section 516 (h)). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $28,000,000 | $15,000,000 |
| 1981 | 35,000,000 | 23,000,000 |
| 1982 | 20,000,000 | 14,400,000 |
| 1983 | 20,000,000 | 14,400,000 |
| 1984 | 20,000,000 | 14,400,000 |

Purposes: The program provides Federal support for (1) the planning, establishment, and development of cooperative education projects in higher education institutions to demonstrate or explore the feasibility or value of innovative methods of comprehensive institutional cooperative education; and (2) research into methods of improving, developing, or promoting the use of cooperative education programs in institutions of higher education. Cooperative education programs have alternating or parallel periods of academic study and employment related to the student's academic program or professional goals.

Eligibility: Accredited institutions of higher education and consortiums of such institutions. Other nonprofit agencies and organizations are also eligible for training and research grants.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984 the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were to:

- Stimulate institutions to initiate school-wide cooperative education for all students.

- Stimulate the development of cooperative education programs for newly participating institutions.

- Provide training grants to assist faculty members and administrators to design and implement cooperative education programs and to emphasize the improvement of training techniques.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

In Fiscal Year 1984 the following activities were funded:

- 17 comprehensive (all-institution) demonstration grants to bring the total to date to 45.
- 159 project administration grants; 10 newly participating institutions received five-year awards to assure funding over the development period.
- Nine grants were awarded to assure nation-wide training opportunities.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Types of Benefits: Four categories of grants are provided under this program.

1. Administration grants: projects generally focus on a single department or cluster of departments in an institution of higher education. Funds are used to develop and strengthen cooperative education programs and to strengthen and expand linkages with employers (and local high school cooperative education programs).
2. Comprehensive demonstration grants: large grants assist institutions to plan and initiate institution-wide cooperative educational approaches to postsecondary programs of study.
3. Research grants: projects collect, study and disseminate information on cooperative education programs and practices.
4. Training grants: projects provide institution program directors and faculty and professionals in business with information on how to administer and expand their cooperative education programs.

Program Scope: In fiscal year 1984, 379 applications were submitted by eligible applicants requesting a total of $53,943,268. (Table 1)

From the $14.4 million appropriation, grants were awarded to 185 of the 379 applicants. Of these 185 awards, 159 were administration grants, totaling $9,400,000; 17 were comprehensive demonstration grants, totaling $4,100,000; and 9 were training grants, totaling $900,000. Grants totaling $5,329,255 were awarded to 70 two-year public and private institutions of higher education; $8,860,745 was awarded to 113 four-year public/private institutions; and 1 grant, for $210,000, was awarded to 1 non-profit organization. (See Table 1 and Table 2.)

It is estimated that 175,000 students enrolled in the program. Distributions to institutions are provided in more detail in Table 1. Of particular interest are average awards to institutions of differing types and control. Also of interest are the distribution to colleges serving large numbers of Black and Hispanic Students (Tables 1, 2, and 3).

## Table 1
## Total Applications to the Cooperative Education Program and Number of Awards By Institutional Type
## Fiscal Years 1982 to 1984

| | FY 1982 | FY 1983 | FY 1984 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total Applications received: | 437 | 437 | 374 |
| Number of Grants awarded by Institutional type: | | | |
| Two year public | 75 | 70 | 65 |
| Two year private | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Two year public | 45 | 48 | 58 |
| Two year private | 73 | 71 | 55 |
| public/private organizations | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| | 197 | 196 | 185 |
| Distribution of Awards to Selected Institutions Serving Minority Students | | | |
| Historically black | 12 | 7 | 6 |
| predominately Hispanic | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| predominately Black (not HBCU) | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| | 22 | 13 | 14 |

Source: See E below.

## Table 2
## Distribution of Students and Award Levels in the Cooperative Education Program By Institution Type
## For Fiscal Years 1982 to 1984

| | FY 1982 | FY 1983 | FY 1984 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Total Number of Students | 170,000 | 175,000 | 175,000 |
| Distribution of Funds Awarded By Institutional Type: | | | |
| Two year public | $4,370,872 | $4,719,400 | $5,146,155 |
| Two year private | 123,392 | 196,200 | 183,100 |
| Four year public | 2,919,734 | 3,125,100 | 5,304,726 |
| Four year private | 6,811,002 | 6,119,300 | 3,556,019 |
| public/private organizations | $175,000 | $240,000 | $210,000 |
| Distribution of Awards to Selected Institutions Serving Minority Students | | | |
| Historically Black | $1,542,458 | $614,000 | $341,600 |
| predominately Hispanic | 147,392 | 89,100 | 272,000 |
| predominately Black (not HBCU) | 753,269 | 536,300 | 466,100 |
| predominately Asian | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Source: See E below.

Table 3
Average Awards in the Cooperative Education Program
By Institution Type
For Fiscal Years 1982 to 1984

| | FY 1982 | FY 1983 | FY 1984 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Average award to | | | |
| 2 year public | $58,278 | $67,420 | $79,172 |
| 2 year private | 41,131 | 48,050 | 36,620 |
| 4 year public | 64,883 | 65,106 | 91,461 |
| 4 year private | 93,301 | 86,187 | 64,655 |
| Average Grants Awarded to Selected Institutions Serving Minority Students | | | |
| Historically Black | $128,538 | $87,729 | $56,933 |
| predominately Hispanic | 36,848 | 44,550 | 90,666 |
| predominately Black (not HBCU) | 125,545 | 134,075 | 93,220 |
| predominately Asian | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Source: See E below.

Program Effectiveness: In 1970, fewer than 200 institutions were participating in Cooperative Education. By 1980, well over 1,000 schools had such a program. Most of the increase was due to the availability of Federal funds, since half of all applicants received awards. Although one-third of all postsecondary institutions have participated in the program, only about two percent of all students have participated in the program.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration did not request funds for this program for FY 1985. With more than one-third of the Nation's postsecondary institutions supporting cooperative education and with more widespread recognition of the benefits of this educational approach, there is no longer a pressing need for Federal encouragement and stimulation in this area. However, if institutions that want to continue their cooperative education projects can do so through the Work-Study program if the Administration's proposed legislation is passed.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 1984.

## F. Other Supporting Data

None

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are currently in progress or planned.

## Contacts for Further Information

Program operations:  Stanley B. Patterson, (202) 245-3253

Program studies:  Jim Maxwell, (202) 245-7884

# COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM
# (CFDA No. 84.142)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Housing Act of 1950, Title IV, P.L. 81-475 (12 U.S.C 1749) Participation Sales Act of 1966, P.L. 89-429 as amended by Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, P.L. 89-117, Department of Education Organization Act, Sec. 306, P.L. 96-88, Department of Education Appropriation Act of 1984, Sec. 308, P.L. 98-139. (No expiration date)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Annual | Permanent |
| 1980 | Indefinite | $13,645,000 | $212,000 |
| 1981 | " | 0 | 279,000 |
| 1982 | " | 0 | 232,000 |
| 1983 | " | 0 | 40,000 |
| 1984 | " | 0 | 0 |

Purpose: To alleviate severe student and faculty housing and related facility shortages through the support of new construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation and to reduce fuel consumption and other operating costs of existing facilities. Recently, loans have been limited to cost-effective energy conservation, rehabilitation, renovation, and relief of severe local housing shortages.

Eligibility: The College Housing Program enables the Secretary of Education to make direct Federal loans to higher education institutions and certain other eligible college housing agencies at 3 percent interest. The funds are made available through a revolving fund financed with U.S. Treasury borrowings and proceeds from the sale of public securities (participation certificates, backed by pools of existing college housing loans) marketed through the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA).

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives for the College Housing Program were:

- Provide low interest loans to institutions of postsecondary education for the purchase, construction, or rehabilitation of housing and related facilities in order to relieve severe housing and related facility needs in the higher education community.

A. Goals and Objectives (continued)

- Administer the annual loan competition in an accurate and sound manner and to ensure that awards were made on schedule.
- Continue efforts in credit management improvement to ensure that sound loans were made, and to ensure that the Federal interest was protected. Continue to improve the verification and validation controls of the program.
- Support the objectives of the President's Executive Order 12320 to assist historically black colleges and universities.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- In FY 1984, the Department awarded $40 million in new loan commitments supporting 11 housing construction projects and 18 energy conservation projects. The loan competition was accurate, sound, and timely, in part because computers were used to rank housing applications. ED also continued to use engineering consultants to review and monitor projects in order to ensure project feasibility and compliance.
- ED improved its credit management as follows:
  - Used the government field expense allotments, a legislative set-aside, in order to monitor projects through the construction period.
  - Continued to use procedures to ensure the financial soundness of new loans using such resources as Federal Reserve Bank delinquency listings, financial status reports, and regulatory provisions relating to institutional eligibility and loan cancellation.
  - Completed inventory of all closed projects to ensure prompt and proper billing by the Federal Reserve Bank, cancelled inactive loans, and enforced policy requiring institutions to begin construction within 18 months of loan reservation.
  - Continued procedure to ensure prompt delivery of notes and bonds to the Federal Reserve Bank.
  - Conducted more in-depth credit review with special conditions if necessary on loan agreements.
- The Department awarded nearly 20 percent of available funds to historically black colleges and universities in FY 1982, and again exceeded the regulatory 10 percent minimum set-aside provision for those institutions in FY 1983. The Department awarded 23 percent of FY 1984 funds $9,327,000 to those institutions.

## C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

New Loan Commitments: In FYs 1982 through 1985, $40 million was directed by Congress each year to be made available for new loans.

Table 1 shows the distribution of loan commitments for 1982 through 1984. These commitments were supported with the resources of the program's revolving fund and required no appropriation. Each year approximately three-quarters of the funds were committed for construction while 25 percent was committed for energy conservation projects.

Table 1
Loan Commitments of the College Housing Program
FY 1982 to FY 1984

| Type of Award | Fiscal Year Commitments | | | Fiscal Year Commitments (in thousands) | | | Fiscal Year Average Loan (in thousands) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 |
| Housing Construction Projects | 14 | 13 | 11 | $30,043 | $29,978 | $30,000 | $2,145 | $2,306 | $2,727 |
| Energy Conservation Projects | 5 | 15 | 18 | $ 9,957 | $10,022 | $10,000 | $1,991 | $ 668 | $ 556 |
| Total | 19 | 28 | 29 | $40,000 | $40,000 | $40,000 | | | |

Source: See E.1. below

Indirect or Off-Budget Costs: The Federal Government absorbs the difference between the approximately 3 percent interest paid by institutions on their college housing loans and the prevailing interest rate for Treasury borrowing. Therefore, most of this program's cost is off-budget and does not appear as a direct expense under the program account. The off-budget cost in FY 1984 approximated $219 million. This amount is slowly decreasing because the level of outstanding loans in the portfolio is decreasing. The account, however, realizes a small income since it reimburses the Treasury at a rate of only 2.75 percent.

Servicing Existing Commitments: Full amortization of the principal liability ($451.504 million) on GNMA participation certificates, marketed to the public in 1967-68, must be completed by FY 1988. Institutional loan repayments must be used largely for this purpose, rather than for making new loan commitments. (See Table 2).

### Table 2

### Aggregate Loan Portfolio of the College Housing Program

| | 1984 | 1983 | 1982 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Selected Assets** | | | |
| Outstanding Loan Volume | $2,675,520,000 | $3,025,464,000 | $3,045,113,000 |
| GNMA Fund | 337,357,000 | 89,207,000 | 41,716,000 |
| **Selected Liabilities** | | | |
| Outstanding Treasury Borrowing | $2,687,325,000 | $2,687,325,000 | $2,687,325,000 |
| Outstanding GNMA Liability | 451,504,000 | 451,504,000 | 451,504,000 |
| Defaulted Loan Volume[a] | 105,561,000 | 114,700,000 | 116,000,000 |

[a] This is an expected offset on the outstanding loan volume.

Source: E.1.

In FY 1984, the major portion of loan repayments and other income was used to pay program operating costs. These costs include the following.

- An estimated $70,212,000 for interest expenses on borrowed Treasury funds used to make loans in prior years. This expense was $67,613,000 in 1983.

- Interest expenses of $28,138,000 on GNMA participation certificates (the same expense level as 1983).

- Principal payments of $248,151,000 to the GNMA participation sales fund. These funds have been used to amortize the outstanding principal debt on participation certificates which will be redeemed in by FY 1988. This transfer payment was $47,491,000 in FY 1983. The Department was able to make this high payment because in FY 1984, 22.8 percent of the outstanding principal balance was retired through prepayments which took advantage of the discount.

- A total of $485,000 for loan servicing and management expenses of the Federal Reserve Bank and maintenance of repossessed properties. This cost was $807,000 in 1983.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

Because enrollments are no longer rapidly expanding, there is no need for a Federal program.

No authority for new loan commitments in FY 1985 was requested. This reflected the Administration's overall effort to reduce Federal discretionary expenditures for non-essential purposes and to reduce Federal borrowing, thereby controlling inflation and relieving pressure on financial markets. In 1984, credit management improvement efforts were continued. Due to the new loan discounting authority about $485.5 million was collected in FY 1984, a $306.3 million increase over FY 1983 collections. FY 1985 collections are expected to be about $151.3 million.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, FY 1984.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are in progress or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program studies: James P. Maxwell, (202) 245-7884

# ANNUAL INTEREST SUBSIDY GRANTS
## (CFDA No. 84.001)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act, Title VII, Part C, Section 734, P.L. 96-374, as amended, (20 U.S.C. 1132c-3). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | Indefinite | $29,000,000 |
| 1981 | Indefinite | 26,000,000 |
| 1982 | Indefinite | 25,500,000 |
| 1983 | Indefinite | 25,000,000 |
| 1984 | Indefinite | 24,500,000 |

Purpose: Reduce the cost of borrowing from non-Federal sources for the construction, reconstruction, and renovation of needed academic facilities. The applicant must finance at least 10 percent of the project through non-Federal sources, must be unable to secure as favorable a loan from other sources, and must undertake the project in an economical manner. No state may receive more than 12.5 percent of the annual appropriation and the aggregate principal cannot exceed $5,000,000 at any one institution per fiscal year.

Eligibility: Higher education institutions or higher education building agencies are eligible.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

The current objectives are to meet the Federal commitment on the 625 remaining commercial loans for construction projects approved prior to FY 1974 and to make no new commitments to subsidize additional loans.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

Funds appropriated in FY 1984 were equal to the Federal commitment on the remaining loans make prior to FY 1974.

### C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Program Scope: The program appropriations represent the difference between the commercial rate on a loan and an interest rate of 3 percent. As of FY 1984, 625 (see Table 1) of these grants are in active pay status, 43 projects have been paid in full, and 43 have been terminated or withdrawn. As can be seen from Table 1, the number of grants in active pay status are expected to remain about the same: 621 in 1983 and 619 for 1985. Outstanding loan volume, however, will decline by about 5 percent from 1980 to 1983 along with the average interest subsidy.

## Table 1

## Impact Data on Annual Interest Subsidy Grants

| | 1983 | 1984 | 1985* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total number of approved loans for interest subsidy commitments | 630 | 625 | 619 |
| Total number of loans in pay status | 621 | 619 | 619 |
| Total number of loans not in pay status | 9 | 6 | 0 |
| Total number of loans paid-off, terminated, and/or withdrawn | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| Average amount of interest subsidy | $38,869 | $38,422 | $38,400 |
| Total outstanding volume of loans for which interest subsidies are made | $1,234,000,000 | $1,208,000,000 | $1,180,000,000 |

---

*Estimated

Source: See E. below

## C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Program Effectiveness: From the program's inception in FY 1970, 711 grants have been approved, subsidizing a $1.4 billion loan volume. The Federal subsidy has exceeded $267 million through FY 1984.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

To meet the Federal commitment to pay interest subsidies on the remaining commercial loans for construction projects approved prior to fiscal year 1974, appropriations as needed will be requested. Funds will support subsidies against the remaining loan volume of $1.18 billion in FY 1985. No new awards will be made. Appropriations, and appropriation requests in future years, will decrease gradually as the loans subject to interest subsidies are retired. The Department will use $4,773,000 of the $8,392,668 in unobligated funds for interest subsidies in 1985.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited Above

Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

## F. Other Supporting Data

None

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies are planned or in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies: James Maxwell, (202) 245-7884

## B. Progress and Accomplishments

A total of $1.3 million was collected from institutions in default during 1984, and $11.5 million during 1983.

## C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Types of Benefits: The program requires two appropriations. The Annual Definite Appropriation covers insufficiencies from Treasury borrowings. The Treasury rate is determined by the average yield for 30 year Treasury certificates for the month preceding the fiscal year which for FY 1985 is 12.5 percent. Institutions are now paying only 3 percent interest but if any new loans were approved, they would be 4 percent loans. The permanent indefinite appropriation is for participation certificates that were sold to the public at interest rates between 4.75 percent and 6.45 percent and average about 6 percent. Again, the colleges pay only 3 percent interest on their loans.

Program Scope: As of FY 85, loans totaling more than $640 million have gone to more than 660 institutions. Since 1975, four new loans, initiated by the Congress, have been made under this program. In 1978, Congress authorized two loans totaling $7.2 million to assist Georgetown University and Tufts University in the construction of two model intercultural centers. In 1981, Congress authorized two additional loans totaling $25 million to assist Boston College in the construction of a new library, and to provide supplemental funds to Georgetown University for the model Intercultural Center project begun in 1978.

Through FY 1985, Congress has appropriated $679.37 million to support loans to institutions from the Treasury with an additional permanent indefinite appropriation of nearly $57 million provided for insufficiencies from participation certificates sold to the public in 1967 and 1968. Of the million in the initial participation certificates, $108 million remain. These certificates will come due in FY 1987 and FY 1988. Now on deposit at GNMA toward the remaining balance is $34.1 million. Interest earnings on the GNMA account have been used to pay the permanent indefinite insufficiency for FY 84 and FY 85.

Program Effectiveness: No studies have been conducted of the overall reconstruction and renovation needs in higher education facilities.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

No new construction loans are planned. Prior to 1982, the unobligated balance of the loan account was to cover deficits in the program's annual operating expenses. In 1982, however, the unobligated balance of the fund was depleted due to new loan activity. Appropriations are now required annually to fund operating deficits.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Sections C and F

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

# LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND RENOVATION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

## (CFDA No. 13.594)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VII, Part C, as amended, (20 U.S.C. 1132d); and Participation Sales Act of 1966; and Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1967. (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation[1] | Indefinite Appropriation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $200,000,000 | $ 2,189,000 | $ 609,000 |
| 1981 | 80,000,000 | 1,656,000 | 1,091,000 |
| 1982 | 80,000,000 | 11,096,000[2] | 37,783,000 |
| 1983 | 80,000,000 | 20,143,000 | 134,000 |
| 1984 | 80,000,000 | 19,846,000 | 0 |

Purpose: To assist higher education institutions in obtaining adequate academic facilities, the Secretary is authorized to make or insure low interest loans for the construction, reconstruction, or renovation of academic facilities.

ED awards loans subject to the following stipulations: (1) not less than 20 percent of the development cost of the facility must be financed from non-Federal sources (this requirement may be waived for schools qualified as developing institutions under HEA Title III), (2) the applicant must have been unable to secure a loan of this size from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this program, (3) construction must be undertaken in an economical manner, (4) in the case of a project to construct an infirmary or other facility designed to provide primarily for outpatient care of students and institutional personnel, no financial assistance will be provided for such projects under Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, (5) the loan must be repaid within 50 years, and (6) the applicant must pay an interest rate of four percent.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education and higher education building agencies (that is State agencies empowered by the State to issue tax-exempt bonds on behalf of private institutions of higher education) are eligible for loans.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

In FY 1984, the Department's objective for this program was to collect on defaulted loans and to improve debt collection efforts.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No additional studies are planned for this program.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program studies: James Maxwell, (202) 245-7884

Notes:

1. Excludes the permanent indefinite appropriation under "Payment of Participation Sales Insufficiencies" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1967.

2. Includes supplemental appropriation of $9,746,000.

# OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

# TERRITORIAL TEACHER TRAINING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM -- PROJECT GRANTS TO TERRITORIAL JURISDICTIONS (CFDA No. 84.124)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Amendments of 1978, Title XV, Part C, Section 1525, P.L. 95-561, (Expired September 30, 1984).*

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $2,000,000 | $2,000,000 |
| 1981 | 2,000,000 | 1,800,000 |
| 1982 | 2,000,000 | 960,000 |
| 1983 | 2,000,000 | 960,000 |
| 1984 | 2,000,000 | 1,000,000 |

Purpose: To provide assistance for the training of teachers in schools in Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

Eligibility: The State educational agency (SEA) of each territory is eligible to apply for an annual grant. Activities must be directed at teachers who work with students in grades K-12 in public and nonprofit private schools. All activities must be directly related to teaching and must be carried out within the territory. Allowable activities include, but are not limited to, inservice teacher training in basic skills development or specific subject areas, curriculum development, use of instructional materials or equipment, classroom management, or training for teachers to achieve full certification under the appropriate territorial requirements.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objective for this program continued to be to distribute grants to upgrade the skills and capacity of teachers in the territories.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department awarded five grants ranging from $95,000 to $415,000 for school year 1984-85. (These awards were made from FY 1985 appropriation act funds.)

---

* The Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511, authorize the program through October 1, 1989.

### C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Scope: Over the first five years of the program, total grants amounted to $6.7 million.

Teachers Trained: About 1,800 teachers received training in school year 1983-84 at an average cost of about $533 per teacher.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available on improvements in teacher skills or capacities resulting from training activities supported by this program.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

There have been no Federal studies of the program.

### F. Other Supporting Data

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Haroldie Spriggs, (202) 254-6572

Program studies: Judith Anderson, (202) 245-9401

# PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES--GRANTS TO STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES (CDFA No. 84.034)

## 1. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services and Construction Act, P.L. 84-597, as amended, (20 U.S.C. 351). (Expires September 30, 1989.)

Funding:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $150,000,000 | $62,500,000 |
| 1981 | 150,000,000 | 62,500,000 |
| 1982 | 65,000,000 | 60,000,000 |
| 1983 | 65,000,000 | 60,000,000 |
| 1984 | 65,000,000 | 65,000,000 |

Purpose: This program has four main purposes: 1) to develop and improve public library service in various geographic areas and to groups of persons with inadequate service; 2) to provide library services for patients and inmates of state-supported institutions, for physically handicapped individuals, for disadvantaged persons in low-income areas, and for those who have limited English-speaking ability; 3) to strengthen metropolitan and urban public libraries which function as regional and national resource centers; and 4) to strengthen the capacity of State library agencies to provide state-wide services.

Eligibility: All State or equivalent library administrative agencies are eligible. Besides the 50 States, this includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department had two principal objectives for this program:

- Encourage the extension of public library services for underserved or unserved counties and small towns across the nation; and
- Encourage innovative library services to disadvantaged, limited English-speaking, State institutionalized, and physically handicapped persons.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Most of the nation's unserved and underserved areas for library service have been reached by increasing the service capacity of State and local library agencies. More than 96 percent of the nation's population has access to library services.

## B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

- More than 25 percent of the program's funds were used to provide innovative library services to persons who are disadvantaged, limited-English-speaking, in State institutions, physically handicapped, or elderly.
- Nearly 75 percent of the program's funds were used to provide for areas that had been without services or with inadequate services, to strengthen metropolitan and major urban libraries as resources centers, and to strengthen State administration of the program.

## C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Program Scope: The Department made 54 grant awards for FY 84. During the past 27 years, over $1 billion of program funds were used to increase access to public libraries and basic information services in underserved areas; and to develop and improve services to special population groups.

Types of Benefits Provided: Services include radio reading for the blind, classes in English-as-a-second-language, materials to assist the mentally retarded (e.g., coping with public transportation, job hunting, and ordering in a restaurant), book collections at senior citizen centers, books-by-mail program for rural residents, and literacy programs for functionally illiterate adults.

Program Effectiveness: Findings of a major study were reported last year.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

New regulations were published on March 30, 1984.

## E., F.

No new information.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Robert Klassen, (202) 254-9664
Program studies: Garrett Coleman, (202) 245-8877

## INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION -- GRANTS TO STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.035)

### I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services and Construction Act, Title III, P.L. 89-511, as amended and extended by P.L. 91-600, P.L. 95-123, and P.L. 97-35. 20 U.S.C. 351. (Expired September 30, 1984)*

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $20,000,000 | $ 5,000,000 |
| 1981 | 20,000,000 | 12,000,000 |
| 1982 | 15,000,000 | 11,520,000 |
| 1983 | 15,000,000 | 11,520,000 |
| 1984 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 |

Purpose: To provide grants to State Library Administrative Agencies for the planning, establishment, and maintenance of cooperative networks of libraries at the local, regional or inter-state level. Such cooperative networks are intended to provide for the systematic and effective coordination of resources of school, public, academic and special libraries and information centers in order to improve the library services to the special clientele served by each type of library or center.

### II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- o Encourage the establishment of inter-institutional networks of libraries for the coordination of informational services in schools, public libraries, academic, and special libraries and information centers.
- o Support the increased capability of the State Library Agencies and regional and local libraries to establish and maintain interlibrary cooperative activities.

---

* The Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-480, authorizes Interlibrary Cooperation through September 30, 1989.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o The FY 1984 appropriation assisted the States with the funding of about 275 cooperative library projects involving over 30,000 libraries of all types.

- o Because of the cost-sharing benefits derived from these projects, 24 States now provide State aid for such purposes, totaling $70 million in FY 1984.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Program Scope: Since 1967 when this program was initiated, over $94 million in Federal funds have been expended for (a) projects linking libraries through telecommunication systems to data bases, (b) resource-sharing projects not linked to automation, and (c) training of library personnel to handle resource sharing and the technological advances inherent in the more complex library networking.

Types of Benefits Provided: Project activities at the State and local public library level are directed toward improving access to educational and informational services offered by libraries. Specific items in support of this objective might include: rapid communications systems for linking libraries (computers, TWX, or telephones); delivery systems (telefacsimile, trucks or mail); location tools (published or computer-based lists of library holdings), computer-based information retrieval and information processing systems; and the costs and fees associated with these activities including the training of personnel.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation

No funds were requested for this program for FY 1985.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. LSCA Grant Reports

F. Other Supporting Data:

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Robert Klassen, (202) 254-9664

Program studies: Art Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

# COLLEGE LIBRARY RESOURCES--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND ELIGIBLE, NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS (CFDA No. 84.005)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Sections 201, 202, and 211 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-A; Public Law 89-329 as amended, by Section 201 of the Education Amendments of 1980, Public Law 96-374 and by Section 516 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Public Law 97-35, (U.S.C. 1021, 1022, and 1029). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $120,000,000 1/ | $ 4,988,000 |
| 1981 | 10,000,000 | 2,988,000 |
| 1982 | 5,000,000 | 1,920,000 |
| 1983 | 5,000,000 | 1,920,000 |
| 1984 | 5,000,000 | -0- |

Purpose: To assist and encourage institutions of higher education and other eligible institutions in the acquisition of library materials. Funds may also be used for the establishment and maintenance of library networks for resource sharing.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, this program received no funding.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

None

### C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

The program was not funded in FY 1984.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

No funding was requested for FY 1985. The program has been terminated.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

None

F. Other Supporting Data

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

None

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Frank Stevens, (202) 254-5090

Program studies: Art Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

Note

1. Authorization for HEA, Title II, Parts A and B.

# LIBRARY CAREER TRAINING--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO AND CONTRACTS WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND LIBRARY ORGANIZATIONS OR AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.036)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-B, Public Law 89-329 as amended by the Education Amendments of 1980, Public Law 96-374, sections 201, 202, 222, and by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Public Law 97-35, (20 U.S.C. 1021, 1022 and 1032). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $120,000,000 1/ | $ 667,000 |
| 1981 | 10,000,000 2/ | 667,000 |
| 1982 | 1,200,000 2/ | 640,000 |
| 1983 | 1,200,000 2/ | 640,000 |
| 1984 | 1,200,000 2/ | 640,000 |

Purpose: To assist institutions of higher education and library organizations and agencies in training persons in the principles and practices of librarianship and information science, including new techniques of information transfer and communication technology.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

The Department's principal objective for FY 1984 was:

- To increase opportunities for members of underrepresented groups to obtain training and retraining in librarianship; in particular, training beyond the master's degree level.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

The 1984 appropriation of $640,000 for this program supported 76 fellowships aimed primarily at upgrading the professional skills of women and members of minority groups.

### C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Program Scope: From 1973 through 1983, 987 (71%) of the 1,392 awards were to target minority groups.

Program Effectiveness: Annual reports from previous years (E.1) indicate that recipients of training had few if any problems in getting jobs upon completion of the Master's Degree or advancing to more senior positions following their studies.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

For Fiscal Year 1984 and 1985, termination of funding was proposed by the Department, because there is no longer a critical shortage of librarians.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Program files which contain narrative and fiscal reports, personal interviews, and professional literature.

### F. Other Supporting Data

1. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics Library Human Resources: A Study of Supply and Demand. King Research Inc., May, 1983.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

Because there is no definitive data on the impact of Title II-B, HEA, Library Career Training, the Department has contracted for a study, Historical Review of Higher Education Act, Title II-B Fellowships Program.

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the accomplishments of the past recipients of fellowship awards under HEA II-B, Library Career Training program and to determine the effects of the change in legislation enacted in 1971. Ancillary purposes are to determine if shortages in graduate library school faculties have been reduced, whether or not minorities and women have reached top management in libraries, and whether or not minorities have entered the profession.

### Contacts for Further Information:

Program operation: Frank A. Stevenson, (202) 254-5090

Program effectiveness: Art Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

### Notes

1. Includes authorization for HEA Title II, Part A (College Library Resources) and Part B.

2. Authorization for HEA Title II, Part B, Section 222, 223, 224.

# LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS -- DISCRETIONARY GRANTS AND CONTRACTS WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER ELIGIBLE AGENCIES, INSTITUTIONS, AND ORGANIZATIONS
(CFDA No. 84.039)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Sections 201, 202, and 223 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-B, Public Law 89-329 as redesignated by Section 111 of the Education Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-318 amended by Section 201 of the Education Amendments of 1980, Public Law 96-374, and by Section 516 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Public Law 97-35; (20 U.S.C. 1021, 1022, and 1033). (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $120,000,000 1/ | $333,000 |
| 1981 | 10,000,000 2/ | 250,000 |
| 1982 | 1,200,000 2/ | 240,000 |
| 1983 | 1,200,000 2/ | 240,000 |
| 1984 | 1,200,000 2/ | 240,000 |

Purpose: To make grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher education and other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations for (1) research and/or demonstration projects related to the improvement of libraries, (2) training in librarianship and information technology, and (3) dissemination of information derived from such projects.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education, public and private agencies, institutions, or organizations.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1984, the Department's principal objectives for the programs were:

1. To monitor the following projects:
    a. New Directions in Library and Information Science Education;
    b. Diffusion of Innovation in Library and Information Science;

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

c. Historical Impact of Higher Education Act, Title II-B, Library Career Training;

d. The Role of Libraries in Creating and Providing Viewtext Information Services.

2. To complete Phase II, Libraries and the Learning Society

3. To enter into a cooperative project with The Center of the Book, at the Library of Congress and the National Center for Education Statistics to study the role of the book in the future.

4. To award a contract to review accrediting procedures for Library and Information Science programs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

The Department monitored the following projects of the HEA II-B, Research and Demonstration program:

1. (a) New Directions in Library and Information Science Education which will determine the present and future competencies needed by library and information science professionals. The final report is expected by December 1984.

(b) Diffusion of Innovation in Library and Information Science which will identify innovations developed and adopted for use in library and information science; trace the development and distribution of innovation(s); develop a model for planned diffusion; and recommend options for building a diffusion network. The project report is expected by December 1984.

(c) Historical Review of HEA II-B Fellowships, which focused on the contributions made to the library and information science profession by recipients of HEA II-B fellowships since passage of HEA in November 1965. The final report is in progress.

(d) Role of Libraries in Creating and Providing Viewtext, Information Services, which includes 9 case studies of school library media centers, public, academic, and special libraries plus an extensive bibliography. The report is now available from ERIC.

2. Phase II of Libraries and the Learning Society - was a series of five seminars at which participants representing all types of libraries and information science areas (plus teachers, academicians, State school superintendents, parents, and others) defined the role of libraries in responding to A Nation at Risk. The publication, Alliance for Excellence: Libraries Respond to "A Nation at Risk", resulted from these seminars.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

3. The Role of the Book in the Future project, co-sponsored with the Center for the Book at the Library of Congress and the National Center for Education Statistics, sponsored a meeting of 21 prominent citizens including representatives of business, professors of science and physics, a regional library system director, school of library and information science staff, book publishers, and The Executive Secretary of the American Library Association to study the role of the book in the future and the influence of computers and video technologies on books, reading, and the printed word. The committee report, and that of two consultants, will be presented to the Congress in November, 1984.

4. A Project to Explore Procedures and Guidelines for Participation of a Variety of Associations in the Accreditation of Programs in Library and Information Science has been awarded to the American Library Association (ALA). ALA will be assisted by eight other associations and organizations interested in accrediting library and information science programs and in developing a set of procedures and guidelines for evaluating such programs prior to accreditation.

### C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope:

- The FY 1984 program activities have generated an awareness of library issues. New Direction in Library and Information Science Education has been the focus of two major associations' conferences, numerous articles in the library press and presentations by the contractors.

- The Libraries and the Learning Society seminars' report Alliance for Excellence is influencing thousands of librarians and information scientists. The report is discussed at each State library and education media conference.

Program Effectiveness: No data available.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

No funds were requested for FY 1985.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

None.

### F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information:

Program Operations: Frank Stevens, (202) 254-5090

Program Effectiveness: Arthur S. Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

### Notes

1. Authorization for HEA Titles II-A and II-B
2. Authorization for HEA Title II-B, Sections 222, 223, and 224

# STRENGTHENING RESEARCH LIBRARY RESOURCES-
# DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO MAJOR RESEARCH LIBRARIES
# (CFDA No. 84.091)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 89-329 Title II, Part C, of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended by Section 201 of the Education Amendments of 1980 (P.L. 96-374), and P.L. 97-35, 20 U.S.C. 1021. (Expires September 30, 1985.)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $20,000,000 | $6,000,000 |
| 1981 | 10,000,000 | 6,000,000 |
| 1982 | 15,000,000 | 5,760,000 |
| 1983 | 15,000,000 | 6,000,000 |
| 1984 | 15,000,000 | 6,000,000 |

Purpose: To promote research and education of high quality throughout the United States by providing financial assistance to (1) help major research libraries maintain and strengthen their collections; and (2) assist them in making their holdings available to other libraries and to individual researchers and scholars outside their primary clientele.

Eligibility: Only major research libraries are eligible. Major research libraries may be public or private nonprofit institutions, including the resources of an institution of higher education, independent research libraries, and State or public libraries. They must demonstrate that they have collections which make a significant contribution to higher education and research, are broadly based, are recognized as having national or international significance for scholarly research, and contain material not widely available but in substantial demand by researchers and scholars not connected with the applicant institution.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

### A. Goals and Objectives:

During FY 1984 the Department's objectives for this program were to:

- Increase access to research materials.
- Preserve unique materials.
- Assist research libraries in acquiring distinctive, unique, and specialized materials.

A. Goals and Objectives: (continued)

- Promote cooperative activity among institutions.
- Extend benefits to as many institutions as possible including previously unfunded institutions.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- Twenty-eight of the 35 fiscal year 1984 grantees chose bibliographic control as the principal area of project activity by adding new entries to national data bases, thus making additional research materials accessible.
- Fourteen grantees used Title II-C funds for advanced preservation techniques to make rare and unique materials more available.
- Seven grantees acquired specialized materials and entered the bibliographic records into national data bases, making additional unique materials accessible and available to researchers and scholars.
- Three cooperative projects, involving 21 institutions, were funded.
- Eight new grantees were among the 35 primary grantees funded in fiscal year 1984; counting institutions benefiting under cooperative projects, 53 research libraries were supported.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope: In fiscal year 1984, 97 applicants requested $18,848,611. The FY 1984 appropriation of $6 million supported 35 grants involving 53 separate major research libraries. The grants ranged in size from $62,325 to $700,000, with an average of $171,000. All geographic areas of the country are represented. Types of institutions receiving grants are:

| | |
|---|---|
| Libraries at Institutions of Higher Education | 29 |
| Independent Research Libraries | 4 |
| Public Libraries | 1 |
| Museums | 1 |

Major Activities and Associated Benefits:

- Implementation of national bibliographic network. Through systematic sharing of bibliographic data, access to rare materials is facilitated and thousands of hours are saved by eliminating duplicative efforts in cataloguing and indexing. In FY 1984, 76 percent of the total funds awarded ($4,526,772) were used for bibliographic control.
- Physical preservation of rare materials. Poor physical condition limits access and use, and progressive deterioration may eventually result in the total loss of rare materials. In FY 1984, 14 of the 35 grantees

Major Activities and Associated Benefits: (continued)

used part or all of their Title II-C funds to preserve fragile and deteriorating research materials. Seventeen percent of the funds awarded ($1,044,973) were spent for this activity.

- Development of specialized collections . Centralized collections of rare or specialized materials facilitate research. In FY 1984, $428,255 went to support collections of the personal papers of eight modern writers, Russian emigré imprints, Gilbert and Sullivan autograph and manuscript documents, Melanesian Studies, New Hampshire publications, and African Studies materials.

## D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration requested no funds for this program for FY 1985.

## E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C:

None.

## F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

### Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Frank Stevens (202) 254-5090

Program studies: Arthur S. Kirschenbaum (202) 245-8307

# PUBLIC LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION--GRANTS TO STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES
(CFDA No. 84.154)

## I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services and Construction Act, Title II, P.L. 84.597 and Emergency Jobs Act, P.L. 98-8 (20 USC-351). (Expires September 30, 1984)

Funding Since 1980:

| Fiscal Year | Authorization | Appropriation |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | 0 | 0 |
| 1981 | 0 | 0 |
| 1982 | 0 | 0 |
| 1983 | $50,000,000 | $50,000,000 |
| 1984 | 0 | 0 |

Purpose: The Emergency Jobs Act appropriated $50 million in FY 1983 for public library construction to be administered under the authority of the Library Services and Construction Act, Title II, program for public library construction. The Emergency Jobs Act was intended to provide jobs for long-term umemployed Americans and to create Federal projects of lasting value to the Nation and its citizens.

Eligibility: All State Library Administrative agencies in the 50 States, Washington, D.C., and Puerto Rico.

## II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)

### A. Goals and Objectives

During Fiscal Years 1983 and 1984, the Department's principal objective for this program was to fund public library construction projects to create jobs for unemployed workers in areas of high unemployment.

### B. Progress and Accomplishments

In Fiscal Years 1983 and 1984, ED distributed $49.5 million to all States, but Hawaii, for over 500 library construction projects. The Federal funds stimulated the appropriation of local and State matching funds of over $99 million. ED estimates that approximately 3,600 jobs were created by the program in those two years.

### C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

A survey of public library construction needs for 1981-1985 indicated that $2.3 billion was needed for over 2,800 library projects. 1/ The Emergency Jobs Act funds enabled local communities to reduce this backlog of construction needs.

### C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

About one-half of the funds were expended for new buildings and about one-quarter each for additions and remodeling projects. Many projects were designed to improve energy efficiency of libraries. A number of other projects provided library accessibility to handicapped persons. The annual appropriation remains available until expended. In FY 1983 about $28.5 million was obligated and in FY 1984 over $21 million was obligated.

### D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The President signed a new five-year reauthorization (P.L. 98-480) on October 17, 1984.

### E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. American Library Association. Public Library Construction Needs: 1981-85.

### F. Other Supporting Data

Library Services and Construction Act, Title II grantee and subgrantee fiscal and program applications and reports.

## III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

### Contacts for further Information

Program Operations: Robert Klassen, (202) 254-9664

Program Studies: Art Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

# APPENDIX

---

## EVALUATION CONTRACTS ACTIVE IN OPBE DURING FISCAL YEAR 1984

---

## SUMMARY OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION CONTRACTS AS OF JAN. 10, 1985

| SER. NO. | CONTRACT NUMBER | DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT | CONTRACTOR NAME, LOCATION, AND TYPE, START AND END DATES | PROJECT MONITOR & ORGANIZATION | OBLIG DOLLARS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. STATE AND LOCAL GRANTS DIVISION | | | | | |
| 1 77 502 | 100-76-0127,100-79-0101<br>FUNDING HISTORY, FY 77: 25000<br>78: 25000<br>79: 25000<br>80: 15000<br>81: 15000<br>82: 15000<br>83: 15000 | PREPARATION OF COMPUTER-PREPARED TABLES FOR ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL REPORT ON STATE USES OF FEDERAL EDUCATION FUNDS (GEPA 406A) | PINKERTON COMPUTER CONSULTANTS<br>BAILEY'S CROSSROADS, VA. (P)<br>2/77 TO 9/85 | ANDERSON J I<br>OPBE | 135000 |
| 1 81 201 | 300-81-0420<br>FUNDING HISTORY, FY 81: 477541<br>82: 493058 | ESAA MAGNET SCHOOLS STUDY (ESAA FUNDS) | JAMES H LOWRY & ASSOCIATES<br>CHICAGO, ILL. (P)<br>10/81 TO 10/83 | LEWIS<br>OPBE | 970599 |
| 1 82 101 | 300-82-0374<br>COMPLETED--REPORT AVAILABLE<br>FUNDING HISTORY, FY 82: 1398465<br>83: 1399654 | OPERATION OF ECIA CHAPTER I EVALUATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER--I | RMC RESEARCH CORP.<br>PORTSMOUTH, N. H. (P)<br>10/82 TO 9/84 | ANDERSON-NG<br>OPBE | 2798119 |
| 1 82 102 | 300-82-0375<br>COMPLETED--REPORT AVAILABLE<br>FUNDING HISTORY, FY 82: 1246381<br>83: 1399224<br>84: 1005000 | OPERATION OF ECIA CHAPTER I EVALUATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER--II | ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY, .INC.<br>INDIANAPOLIS, IND. (P)<br>10/82 TO 9/85 | ENGLISH<br>OPBE | 3650605 |
| 1 82 103 | 300-82-0376<br>COMPLETED--REPORT AVAILABLE<br>FUNDING HISTORY, FY 82: 1219917<br>83: 1399700<br>84: 2010000 | OPERATION OF ECIA CHAPTER I EVALUATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER--III | EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE<br>ATLANTA, GA. (N)<br>10/82 TO 9/85 | ENGLISH<br>OPBE | 4629617 |
| 1 82 104 | 300-82-0377<br>COMPLETED--REPORT AVAILABLE<br>FUNDING HISTORY, FY 82: 1297894<br>83: 1398401<br>84: 1145000 | OPERATION OF ECIA CHAPTER I EVALUATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER--IV | NORTHWEST REGIONAL LABORATORY<br>PORTLAND ORE. (N)<br>10/82 TO 9/85 | ANDERSON-NG<br>OPBE | 3841295 |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

```
                          SUMMARY OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION CONTRACTS AS OF JAN. 10, 1985

SER.                                                                    CONTRACTOR NAME,            PROJECT MONITOR  OBLIG
NO.          CONTRACT NUMBER          DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT         LOCATION, AND TYPE,          & ORGANIZATION  DOLLARS
                                                                      START AND END DATES

1 83 101    30C-83-0286           A STUDY OF LOCAL OPERATIONS UNDER   STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE       CHELEPER      1032725
                                  ECIA CHAPTER 2                      MENLO PARK, CALIF.         (N)    OPBE
                                                                       8/83 TO 12/85
  FUNDING HISTCRY, FY 83:    567725
                      84:    465000

1 83 102    30C-82-0380           EDUCATION ANALYSIS CENTER           ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY INC           ANDERSON-NG    635264
                                                                      MCLEAN, VA.                (P)    OPBE
                                                                      10/82 TO  9/85
  FUNDING HISTCRY, FY 83:    242933
                      84:    392331

1 83 201                          NATIONAL LONGITUDINAL EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES            SHULER        4133352
                                  THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVICES FOR   ARLINGTON, VA.             (P)    OPBE
                                  LANGUAGE-MINORITY LIMITED-ENGLISH-  12/82 TO 12/84
                                  PROFICIENT STUDENTS
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:   1514000
                      84:   2619352

1 84 101    30C-84-0225           ASSESSMENT OF CHAPTER 1 GRANT       RESEARCH & EVALUATION ASSOCIATES  TUCKER         263091
                                  PROGRAM FOR THE HANDICAPPED         CHAPEL HILL, N.C.          ( )    OPBE
                                                                       9/84 TO  9/85
  FUNDING HISTCRY, FY 84:    263091

1 84 102   .30C-84-0253           ANALYSIS OF STATE VOCATIONAL REHAB- ECOSOMETRICS, INC.                KIRSCHENBAUM   534000
                                  ILITATION AGENCY CASELOAD AND       BETHESDA, MD.              (P)    OPBE
                                  PLACEMENT PATTERNS AND TRENDS        9/84 TO  1/87
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 84:    534000

....................SUBTOTAL STATE AND LCCAL GRANTS DIVISION          22623667

  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 67-69:         0
                         70:         0
                         71:         0
                         72:         0
                         73:         0
                         74:         0
                         75:         0
                         76:         0
                         77:     25000
                         78:     25000
                         79:     25000
                         80:     15000
                         81:    492541
                         82:   5670715
                         83:   7936637
                         84:   8433774
```

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## SUMMARY OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION CONTRACTS AS OF JAN. 10, 1985

```
SER.                                                             CONTRACTOR NAME,           PROJECT MONITOR  OBLIG
NO.        CONTRACT NUMBER          DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT     LOCATION, AND TYPE,        & ORGANIZATION   DOLLARS
                                                                START AND END DATES

3. STUDENT AND INSTITUTIONAL AID DIVISION

3 75 011    FUNDS TRANSFER              SUPPORT OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION     NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION           CORRALLO      954355
                                        PANEL (CONTINUING PROJECT)          WASHINGTON, D. C.               (F)   OPBE
                                                                             7/74 TO 12/84
  FUNDING HISTCRY, FY 75:     63442
                      76:     62900
                      77:     70000
                      78:     77190
                      79:     77250
                      80:    141262
                      81:     99757
                      82:    111162
                      83:    121392
                      84:    130000

3 78 010    300-78-0356                 EVALUATION OF THE SPECIAL SERVICES  SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CORP.              BERLS        1613185
                                        FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS PROGRAM  SANTA MONICA, CAL.              (P)   OPBE
                                                                             9/78 TO 11/83
  FUNDING HISTCRY, FY 78:    995263
                      80:    437922
                      82:    180000

3 81 002    300-81-0245                 SUPPORT OF COOPERATIVE INSTI-       CAL, U OF, AT LOS ANGELES             BART          551480
                                        TUTIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM           LOS ANGELES CAL.                (A)   OPBE
                                        DATA ACQUISITION AND ANALYSIS OF     3/81 TO  6/87
                                        ANNUAL FRESHMAN SURVEY
  FUNDING HISTCRY, FY 81:    110000
                      82:    121684
                      83:    181146
                      84:    138650

3 81 003    300-81-0210                 TECHNICAL SUPPORT FOR POSTSECONDARY APPLIED SYSTEMS INSTITUTE             MORRISSEY     775660
                                        EDUCATION PLANNING                  WASHINGTON, D. C.               (P)   OPBE
                                                                             7/81 TO  4/86
  FUNDING HISTCRY, FY 81:     95966
                      82:    197361
                      83:    279976
                      84:    202357

3 83 102    300-83-0023                 ANALYSIS OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF     FROOMKIN, JOSEPH, INC.                MORRISSEY       8453
                                        COLLEGE COSTS, PARENTAL CONTRIBUTICN WASHINGTON, D.C.               (P)   OPBE
                                        AND STUDENT ASSISTANCE               3/83 TO  2/84
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:      8453
```

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

```
                       SUMMARY OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION CONTRACTS AS OF JAN. 10, 1985

SER.
NO.        CONTRACT NUMBER           DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT          CONTRACTOR NAME,        PROJECT MONITOR  OBLIG
                                                                       LOCATION, AND TYPE,     & ORGANIZATION  DOLLARS
                                                                       START AND END DATES

...................SUBTOTAL STUDENT AND INSTITUTIONAL AID DIVISION       3903133

  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 67-69:        0
                        70:         0
                        71:         0
                        72:         0
                        73:         0
                        74:         0
                        75:     63442
                        76:     62900
                        77:     70000
                        78:   1072453
                        79:     77250
                        80:    579184
                        81:    305723
                        82:    610207
                        83:    590967
                        84:    471007
```

```
                     SUMMARY OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION CONTRACTS AS OF JAN. 10, 1985

SER.                                                                  CONTRACTOR NAME,        PROJECT MONITOR  OBLIG
NO.        CONTRACT NUMBER          DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT          LOCATION, AND TYPE,     & ORGANIZATION   DOLLARS
                                                                      START AND END DATES

5. QUALITY AND EQUALITY OF EDUCATION DIV.

5 83 101    300-82-0248          EDUCATION ANALYSIS CENTER       PELAVIN ASSOCIATES              NASSETTA       1051927
                                                                 WASHINGTON, D.C.          ( )   OPBE
                                                                 10/82 TO  9/85
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:    506626
                      84:    545301

...................SUBTOTAL QUALITY AND EQUALITY OF EDUCATION DIV.          1051927

  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 67-69:           0
                         70:           0
                         71:           0
                         72:           0
                         73:           0
                         74:           0
                         75:           0
                         76:           0
                         77:           0
                         78:           0
                         79:           0
                         80:           0
                         81:           0
                         82:           0
                         83:      506626
                         84:      545301
```

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

```
                    SUMMARY OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION CONTRACTS AS OF JAN. 10, 1985

SEQ.                                                                   CONTRACTOR NAME,          PROJECT MONITOR  OBLIG
NO.          CONTRACT NUMBER          DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT          LOCATION, AND TYPE,       & ORGANIZATION   DOLLARS
                                                                       START AND END DATES

7. PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS DIV.

7 83 101    30C-83-0211               DATA PROCESSING & TECHNICAL SUPPORT  DECISION RESOURCES CORPORATION   DE KANTER   1383750
                                      FOR PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS  WASHINGTON, D.C.           ( )   OPBE
                                      DIVISION                              [illegible]/83 TO 12/85
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:    485000
                      84:    898750

7 83 102    30C-83-0250               DESCRIPTION AND LONGITUDINAL SURVEY  SRA TECHNOLOGIES                 BAKER       1300000
                                      OF IMMERSION PROGRAMS FOR BILINGUAL  MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA          ( )   OPBE
                                      STUDENTS                             10/83 TO  9/88
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:    800000
                      84:    500000

7 83 103    30C-83-0260               A SURVEY OF SERVICES TO SECONDARY    NAOMI GRAY ASSOCIATES            DE KANTER    615790
                                      LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT           SAN FRANCISCO, CA          ( )   OPBE
                                      STUDENTS                             10/83 TO  9/85
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 84:    615790

7 84 101    30C-84-0263               RETROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS OF DISTAR     UNIVERSITY OF OREGON             BAKER         82157
                                      FOR BILINGUAL STUDENTS               EUGENE, OREGON             (A)   OPBE
                                                                            9/84 TO  9/85
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:     82157

7 84 102    30C-84-0264               EVALUATION OF INDIAN-CONTROLLED      ABT ASSOCIATES                   BARNES       384412
                                      SCHOOLS                              CAMBRIDGE MASS.            (P)   OPBE
                                                                            9/84 TO 11/85
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 84:    384412

7 84 103    40C-84-0268               EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF THE ART  PELAVIN ASSOCIATES               BAKER        130000
                                      OF METHODS USED TO IDENTIFY STUDENTS WASHINGTON, D.C.           ( )   OPBE
                                      FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR BILINGUAL         9/84 TO  9/85
                                      EDUCATION PROGRAMS
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 84:    130000

....................SUBTOTAL PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS DIV.        3896109

  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 67-69:          0
                         70:          0
                         71:          0
                         72:          0
                         73:          0
                         74:          0
                         75:          0
                         76:          0
                         77:          0
                         78:          0
                         79:          0
                         80:          0
                         81:          0
                         82:          0
                         83:    1367157
                         84:    2528952
```

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

```
                              SUMMARY OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION CONTRACTS AS OF JAN. 10, 1985

SER.                                                                          CONTRACTOR NAME,          PROJECT MONITOR  OBLIG
NO.            CONTRACT NUMBER             DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT           LOCATION, AND TYPE,       & ORGANIZATION  DOLLARS
                                                                              START AND END DATES

9. COORDINATION STAFF

9 77 001     FUNDS TRANSFER TO IRMS     COMPUTER TIME IN SUPPORT OF          ELECTRONIC DATA SYSTEMS CORP.     MARONEY        1735508
                                        PLANNING AND EVALUATION PROJECTS     ROCKVILLE, MD                (P)  OPBE
                                        (INCLUDES $5000 TITLE I FUNDS IN      5/77 TO  9/84
                                        FY 80)
  FUNDING HISTCRY, FY 77:      33124
                      78:     247000
                      79:     295000
                      80:     27C000
                      81:     220000
                      82:     258384
                      83:     240000
                      84:     172000

9 82 001      WMZI ACCT AT NIH          TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO NIH FOR USE OF  NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH     MARONEY         766000
                                        NIH COMPUTER FACILITY                BETHESDA, MD.                (F)  OPBE
                                                                             10/81 TO  9/84
  FUNDING HISTCRY, FY 82:     225000
                      83:     318000
                      84:     231000

9 84 101     300-84-0259                ANALYSIS OF COSTS AND BENEFITS IN    RUTGERS UNIVERSITY                SPITZER         170920
                                        REHABILITATION                       NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.         ( )  OPBE
                                                                              9/84 TO  9/85
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 84:     170920

....................SUBTOTAL COORDINATION STAFF                            2672428

  FUNDING HISTCRY, FY 67-69:          0
                          70:          0
                          71:          0
                          72:          0
                          73:          0
                          74:          0
                          75:          0
                          76:          0
                          77:      33124
                          78:     247000
                          79:     295000
                          80:     270000
                          81:     220000
                          82:     483384
                          83:     550000
                          84:     573920
```

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

```
                                 SUMMARY OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION CONTRACTS AS OF JAN. 10, 1985
SER.                                                                               CONTRACTOR NAME,          PROJECT MONITOR  OBLIG
NO.          CONTRACT NUMBER                DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT              LOCATION, AND TYPE,       & ORGANIZATION   DOLLARS
                                                                                 START AND END DATES


..................GRAND TOTAL     34147264

   FUNDING HISTORY, FY 67-69:            0
                          70:            0
                          71:            0
                          72:            0
                          73:            0
                          74:            0
                          75:        63442
                          76:        62900
                          77:       128124
                          78:      1344453
                          79:       397250
                          80:       864184
                          81:      1018264
                          82:      6764306
                          83:     10951387
                          84:     12552954
```

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# INDEX TO THE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

## INDEX TO THE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

Note: All three-digit numbers are chapter references. These numbers appear in the upper-right hand corner of each page of the report.

Academic Facilities, 523, 524
Adult Education:
  Indian Education, 113
  State Administered Program, 406
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education, 114
American Indians, see Indian Education
Arts in Education Program, 117

Basic Educational Opportunity (Pell) Grants, 501
Bilingual Education:
  Basic Projects, 201
  Demonstration Projects, 201
  Evaluation, Dissemination, Assessment Centers, 205
  Fellowship Program, 204
  Immigrant Education, 206
  Material Development Projects, 205
  Multifunctional Service Centers, 205
  Research and Development Program, 205
  Schools of Education Projects, 204
  State Education Agency Projects, 205
  Support Services Projects, 205
  Training Projects, 204
  Transition Program for Refugee Children, 203
  Vocational Training, 202
  Vocational Instructor Training, 202
  Vocational Instructional Materials, 202
Block Grant (Elementary and Secondary Education), 104
Business and International Education (Language Training, Area Studies), 520

Captioned Film Loan Program, (Media Services), 312
Centers for Independent Living, 323
Civil Rights Training and Advisory Services, 106
Close Up Foundation (Ellender Fellowships), 110
College Housing Loans, 522, 523, 524
College Library Resources, 604
College Work-Study, 506
College Cooperative Education, 521
Consolidation of Programs for Elementary and Secondary Education, 104
Construction, Schools (in federally affected areas), 109
Cooperative Education, 521

Deaf-Blind, Programs for, 305, 308, 331
Delinquent Children, 103
Desegregation Assistance, 104, 106
  On the Basis of Sex, 106, 115
  On the Basis of National Origin, 106
  On the Basis of Race, 106
Direct Loan Program, 505

Disadvantaged Students:
  Children in State-Administered Institutions, 103
  Education for, 101, 107, 110
  Legal Training for, 517
  Postsecondary Education, 501, 502, 503, 507, 508, 509, 510, 514, 517, 605
  Special Services for, 510
  Vocational Education Programs for, 402
Disaster Aid, 108
Dissemination of Exemplary Educational Practices, 119
Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad, (Fulbright-Hays), 519

Early Education for Handicapped Children, 306
Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, 101, 102, 103, 104, 107, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119
Education for the Disadvantaged, 101, 103, 107, 110, 402, 501, 502, 503, 507, 508, 509, 510, 514, 517, 519, 605
Educational Opportunity Centers, 509
Educational Television and Technology, 119
Elementary and Secondary Education Block Grant, 104
Ellender Fellowships, 110
Entitlement Grants to Local Education Agencies and Indian-Controlled Schools, 111

Faculty Research Abroad (Fulbright-Hays), 519
Fellowships: for Graduate and Professional Study, 518, 519
  for Bilingual Teachers, 204
  for Indian Students, 112
  for Foreign Language and Area Studies, 520
Film, Captioned (Media Services), 312
Follow Through, 107
Foreign Language and Area Studies, 519, 520
Fulbright-Hays Grants, 519
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), 512

General Assistance to the Virgin Islands, 105
Graduate and Professional Study, Fellowships for, 518, 519, 520
Guaranteed Student Loans, 504

Handicapped Children, Early or Preschool Education for, 302, 303, 306
Handicapped:
  Deaf-Blind, Programs for, 305, 308, 331
  Arts in Education, 117
  Client Assistance Program, 326
  Higher Education for, 510
  Independent Living, 333
  Media and Films for, 312
  Migrants, 330
  Personnel Training and Recruitment for Education of, 309, 310, 327
  Recreation, 329
  Regional Resource Centers, 304
  Research, Demonstration, 306, 307, 311, 313, 314, 324, 328
  Services to, 301, 302, 303, 305, 307, 314
  Special Studies, 313

  State Aid Grants, 302
  State-Supported School Programs, State Grant Program, 301
  Vocational Rehabilitation for, 325, 332, 334
Helen Keller National Center, 331
High School Equivalency Program, Migrant Education, 116
Higher Education
  Cooperative Education, 521
  Developing Institutions, 512, 514, 515
  Direct Grants, 501, 502
  Direct Loans, 505
  for the Deaf, 308
  for the Disadvantaged, 501, 502, 503, 507, 508, 509, 510, 514, 515, 517, 605
  for the Handicapped, 308, 510
  for Indian Students, 112
  for Migrant Students, 116
  for Veterans, 511
  for Vocational Students, 401
  for Women, 518, 605
  Guaranteed Student Loans, 504
  Housing, Loans, 522, 523, 524
  Improvement, 512
  Institutional Aid, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 514, 515, 522, 523, 524, 604
  Law, 516, 517
  Postgraduate, 518, 519, 520
  Special Staff Training, 513
  State Student Incentive Grants, 503
  Supplemental Grants, 502
  Talent Search, 508
  Work-Study, 506

Immigrant Education Program, Emergency, 206
Impact Aid, see School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas
Incentive Grants to States for Student Assistance, 503
Independent Living, Centers for, 333
Indian Education:
  Adult Indian Education, 113
  Demonstration Projects, 112
  Educational Service Projects, 112
  Entitlement Grants to Local Education Agencies and Indian-Controlled Schools, 111
  Fellowships for Indian Students, 112
  Personnel Development Projects, 112
  Resource, Evaluation Centers, 112
  Vocational Education for Indian Tribes and Organizations, 404
  Vocational Rehabilitation, 334
Indian Students, Services or Aid to, 101, 111, 112, 113, 404, 406, 507, 509, 510, 517, 518
Inexpensive Book Distribution, 118
Institutions of Higher Education, Payments to 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 514, 515, 522, 523, 524, 604
Interest Subsidy Grants for Academic Facilities Loans, 523
Interlibrary Cooperation, State Grants, 603

International Education and Business Program (Language Training and Area Studies), 520

Language and Areas Studies, 519, 520
Language-Minority or Limited-English-Proficient, Services or Aid to, 101, 102, 116, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 406, 510, 517, 602
Law-Related Education, 119, 516, 517
Law School Clinical Experience, 516
Legal Training for the Disadvantaged, 517
Libraries:
  Career Training, 605
  College Library Resources, 604
  Construction Grants, 608
  Public Library Services, State Grants, 602, 603
  Research and Demonstration, 606
  Strengthening Research Library Resources, 607

Media Services and Captioned Film Loan Program, 312
Migrant Education
  College Assistance Program, 116
  Handicapped, 330
  High School Equivalency Program, 116
  State Formula Grants, 102
Mina Shaughnessy Scholars Program, (FIPSE), 512
Minority Institutions, 515
Minority Students, Services or Aid to, 101, 102, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 403, 404, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 515, 517, 518, 521, 605

National Diffusion Network, 119
National Institute of Handicapped Research, 324

Pell Grants (formerly BEOGs), 501
Personnel Training, Recruitment for Education of the Handicapped, 309, 310, 327
Postsecondary Education (See Higher Education)
Preschool Education for Handicapped Children, 306
Professional Study, Fellowships for, 518, 519, 520
Public Library Services, State Grants, 602, 603

Reading Is Fundamental, (Inexpensive Book Distribution), 118
Recruitment and Information (Special Education), 310
Refugee Children, 203
Rehabilitation, See Vocational Rehabilitation
Research and Development:
  Handicapped, 306, 308, 311, 313, 314, 331
  Libraries, 606, 607
  Secretary's Discretionary Fund, 119
  Vocational Education, 405

Secretary's Discretionary Fund, 114, 119,
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas-School Construction, 109
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas-Maintenance and Operations, 108
Science Improvement, 515

Shaughnessy, Mina, Scholars Program (FIPSE), 512
Special Education, Recruitment and Information, 309, 310
Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, 510
State Student Incentive Grants, 503
Strengthening Research Library Resources, 607
Student Assistance, Postsecondary (See Higher Education)
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, 502

Talent Search, 508
Teacher Training:
  Bilingual Education, 202, 204
  Special Education, 309
  Teachers of Secondary Disadvantaged Students, 110
  Territorial Teachers, 601
  Vocational (Bilingual), 202
Technology and Educational Television, 119
Territorial Teacher Training, 601
Training and Recruitment, Handicapped Education, 309, 310
Training, Librarians, 605
Training, Bilingual Education Projects, 204
Training, Rehabilitation Personnel, 326
Training, Special Program Staff, 513

Upward Bound, 507

Veterans' Cost-of-Instruction, 511
Virgin Islands, General Assistance to, 105
Vocational Education:
  Basic Grants to States, 401
  Bilingual, see Bilingual Vocational Programs
  for Consumer and Homemaking Education, 403
  Programs for the Disadvantaged, 402
  Program for Indian Tribes and Indian Organizations, 404
  Research and Special Projects, 405
Vocational Rehabilitation:
  Centers for Independent Living, 333
  Migratory Farmworkers, 330
  Projects With Industry, 332
  Rehabilitation Services, Basic Support, 325
  Secondary Education and Transition Services, 314
  Severely Handicapped, 328

Women's Educational Equity, 106, 115
Work-Study, College 506